LIFE

OF THE

RIGHT REVEREND GEORGE GLEIG,

LL.D., F.S.S.A.,

BISHOP OF BRECHIN,

AND

PRIMUS OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Dedicated to his Son,

THE REVEREND G. R. GLEIG, M.A.,

LATE CHAPLAIN-GENERAL OF THE FORCES.

BY

THE REV. WILLIAM WALKER, M.A.,

MONYMUSK.

"The bush burned with fire; and the bush was not consumed."
Exodus iii. 2.

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS.

1878.

PRINTED AT
BANFFSHIRE JOURNAL OFFICE,
BANFF.

PREFACE.

As the active part of the long lives of Bishops Jolly and Gleig very nearly coincided in point of time, it is impossible, in writing separate memoirs of the two, to avoid some repetition, especially towards the close of the period, when both of them took a prominent part in Church affairs. It is hoped, however, that there will not be found in this memoir much unnecessary repetition, or, indeed, much matter of any sort which is not of value for the illustration of the Bishop's character, and the Church history of the period. The materials, however, which have been at the Writer's disposal for the preparation of this memoir have been rather abundant; and it is only too possible that some of them may not have been fully sifted and compressed. In addition to the MS. letters and papers made use of in preparing the memoir of Bishop Jolly, the Writer has had access to the following unpublished documents:—

1. The Minute Books of the diocese of Brechin—obligingly submitted to his inspection by the Rev. James Crabb, Synod Clerk of the diocese, and containing, besides information on administrative details, a series of long and very characteristic letters of Bishop Gleig, addressed to his clergy, and read at their "annual meeting."

2. A packet of Bishop Gleig's letters, relating to the affairs of one of the congregations of his diocese (Drumlithie) during a troubled and unsettled period—for the use of which packet the Writer is indebted to the kindness of the Rev. James Gammack, Drumlithie.

3. A series of interesting letters, chiefly regarding incidents in the earlier and later periods of Bishop Gleig's life, written during the preparation of this memoir by the Bishop's distinguished son, the late Chaplain-General of the Forces, in reply to applications for information made to him by the Writer. Mr Gleig invariably told promptly all that he knew; but he manifested a scrupulous anxiety to avoid the risk of communicating a bias to the work. When requested, in order to ensure greater accuracy, to revise the proof sheets of the memoir as it passed through the press, he declined, on this ground, to look at more than the slips which contained the information supplied by himself.

For the middle portion of the life, in addition to MS. authorities, there exist excellent materials in the multitude of publications—letters, articles, reviews, sermons, charges, &c., which Bishop Gleig was continually putting forth, and in which it is easy to read the whole mind and heart of such an open and out-spoken writer.

BISHOP GLEIG.

CHAPTER I.—1753-1786.

Bishop Walker on Bishops Jolly and Gleig—What the Two Men had in Common—How they Differed—Early Life of Gleig—Arbuthnot School—King's College, Aberdeen—Proposal to make him a Professor—Early Jacobitism—Reads for Orders—Is Ordained and Settled at Pittenweem—Circumstances of the Charge—Becomes a Contributor to several London Periodicals—Defends Scotch Bishops in "Gentleman's Magazine"—Criticises Bishop Skinner's Consecration Sermon—Consequences.

BISHOP WALKER, who knew both men intimately, expressed his "astonishment" that two "such men as George Gleig and Alexander Jolly, who would have reflected credit on the most splendid Church Establishment," should have "taken their lot in" such "a Society" as the Episcopal Church of Scotland, when "depressed beyond the hope of rising." The fact he thought "creditable to the Church, and creditable to them."

It is natural to link together the names and lives of these two eminent men, for the reasons which Bishop Walker assigns* (not altogether with strict accuracy), and for others. Both were born in the Stonehaven district, and nearly at the same time. Both became Aberdeen

* See postea p. 3, note †

students and graduates. Both took orders in a Church which was, at the time, all but extinguished by persecution; both became, and for many years continued, influential rulers in it; both lived to a great age, and died about the same time. Lives that had, ecclesiastically, so much in common, if truly told, and read consecutively, cannot fail to throw much light on the Church history of the period, especially as the men, though agreeing substantially in principle, yet differed greatly in their characters, and in the nature of the influence which they wielded; and often looked at events from a different stand-point.

The diversity in the men ought to be borne in mind by the reader, and it may be well to note here the leading characteristics of both. Readers of Bishop Jolly's memoir can have no doubt as to "what manner of man" that consistent Christian was from first to last! From his earliest days he was ever the same, through school, college, tutorship, priesthood, and episcopate, till that last (St Peter's) morning, when, with hands crossed on his breast, and "alone" in his two-storey house, "with God and good Angels," he breathed out his saintly soul in prayer—ever the same humble, gentle, retiring, primitively pious, and devout man of God, "venerable and venerated even in his youth," and thus even in retirement like "the silent finger" of the cathedral spire, "pointing to Heaven"—exerting incalculable influence for good; yet, if anything, *too* silent, and *too* retiring; too much of a mere student, and recluse; "passing his days" too much "among the dead"; too much devoted to mere receptive reading; deficient in energy, initiative, knowledge of the world, and adaptability; living in the past, rather than in the present; a primitive father "born out of due time."

The elder of the two, George Gleig, will be found to be also a very good and consistent, but yet a decidedly different man; less conspicuous (as which of his contemporaries was not?) for the higher graces of character, especially "the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit;" less perfect as a pattern of primitive piety and devotion, and a centre of moral influence; but, in other respects, undoubtedly the superior of his saintly brother; a man of more commanding talent, and versatile powers; of wider mental sympathies, and more varied culture; possessed also of more energy and decision of character; of greater knowledge of the world, and readier discernment of the signs and needs of the time; in short, not only a divine, but a philosopher and a critic; a man of great general literary power and culture; master of a clear and forcible English style; "a robust genius, born to grapple with whole libraries."

The writer is happy to be able to present the early life of Bishop Gleig, to a great extent, in the words* of his distinguished son, the late Chaplain-General to the Forces —the heir of his literary power and fame.

"George Gleig was born at Boghall," in the parish of Arbuthnot, about 7½ miles from Stonehaven, "on the 12th of May 1753. He received his early education at the School of Arbuthnot,† and was much noticed by the eccentric old Viscount, whose sons were his class-fellows and companions. He was always head of his class; and went at a very early age—I do not know exactly, but believe at about 13—to King's College, Aberdeen. It was the custom in those days for a Professor who taught

* In a private communication to the writer.

† If, as Bishop Walker says, he was at Stonehaven School with Alexander Jolly, it must have been only for a short time preparatory to entering the University.

a class, while in the Junior Department of Latin or Humanity, to carry it on through Greek, Logic, Mathematics, and Metaphysics. My father early established such a reputation for himself, that the Professor, when occasionally obliged to absent himself, entrusted the care of the class to young Gleig." This may sound strange in the ears of Aberdeen students of the present day; but the latter fact, Gleig's being occasionally entrusted with the care of the class, sufficiently attests his high academical standing. But of this we have abundant other proofs. "His career was one of the most brilliant on record. His scholarship was of a high order; and in Mathematics, and the Moral and Physical Sciences, he carried off the first prizes."* Nor was the University slow to recognise the merits of her gifted son. "There is good reason to believe that Mr Gleig, after taking his degree, might have aspired (in good hope) to the office of Assistant Professor, with the certainty of succeeding to the first chair which should fall vacant. In that case, however, it would have been necessary for him to subscribe to the Confession of Faith of the Established Church of Scotland, and to take the oaths of allegiance and abjuration."†

In the notice of Mr Gleig's life in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, it is said that he "was selected, while yet an undergraduate, to assist Professor Skene in the instruction of his class." No doubt it was in Professor Skene's class that his curriculum was passed; and it was probably as assistant and successor to Professor Skene that it was proposed to continue him at the University. The proposal could not be entertained; but, naturally, it was one that greatly flattered and pleased the youthful graduate.

* See *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article George Gleig.
† *Ibid.*

It continued through life to be one of his happiest reminiscences, and, in conversation, a frequent and favourite topic with him. "The Bishop often spoke," says his son, "of the proposal to make him a Professor, and used to tell with great glee of the disorder which prevailed in the class when he was left in charge of it."

No doubt, in the dark and poverty-pinched days of his earlier ministry, his thoughts often reverted to that chair of lettered dignity and comfort, which might have been his. The sacrifice, though great, was not perhaps quite so great as it may now seem. A professorship in King's College a hundred years ago, and before "the division of labour" among the chairs, was not the same position as a professorship in the University of Aberdeen now. Yet it was probably not much less an object of high ambition to the graduates; for there was not then the same "open career" for talent that there is now. Anyhow, situated as he was, Mr Gleig gave an incontrovertible proof of principle in resisting the attractions of such a position, "choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of" his own persecuted and down-trodden Communion.

As intimated in the extract from the *Encyclopædia*, the principle to which Mr Gleig then witnessed was not wholly, though chiefly, a religious one. There was in it a mixture of the political. In his youth, Mr Gleig "was a great Jacobite." He could hardly have been other. Jacobitism had been instilled into him from his tenderest years. His ancestors had fought and suffered for the cause. "His father," says the Chaplain-General, "rented a farm under Lord Arbuthnot. I have heard my father say that it belonged to his family till 1715, when his grandfather went out with Lord Mar's force, and escaped being hanged as a traitor, only through the kindness of

his neighbours, and by changing the spelling of his name from Glegg to Gleig." Bishop Gleig's grandfather no doubt fought side by side with Bishop Low's great-grandfather at Sheriffmuir*; for both were from the same district. Sufferings and losses for the cause probably only burnt their Jacobitism deeper into them. It is not said that any member of the family was "out" in the Forty-Five. But all Episcopalians, and not least those in the Stonehaven district,† were grievous sufferers by that last disastrous rising, whether they were personally implicated in it, even by sympathy or not. Young Gleig was not born till seven years after Culloden, and five years after the enactment of the most stringent law against his Church. Yet, in his younger days, he must have seen much, and heard more of the vexatious and disabling effects of that exterminating measure. For one thing, he must occasionally have experienced considerable difficulty in attending the Church service at all. When four or five was the legal congregation, all sorts of shifts had to be resorted to in order to evade the law, such as having service in a house with four persons inside, and any number outside listening at doors and windows; and when this was not possible, the clergyman was sometimes driven to have service sixteen times in one day. Even as late as the earlier years of Bishop Low, who was fifteen years Gleig's junior, petty annoyances to peaceable churchmen were very common. When walking to church with his father, the Bishop said "he well remembered the frequent remonstrances which his father received from neighbours whom he met for "guiding the laddie so ill a gait."‡

* See Blatch's Bishop Low, p. 17.
† See Bishop Jolly, p. p. 4 and 5.
‡ Blatch's Bishop Low, p. 17.

It was inevitable that, growing up thus amid the rankest Jacobite influences, and knowing the actual Government only as a relentless persecutor, young Gleig should, "in early life," have been "a great Jacobite." And so his son says he was; "but," he adds, "as years advanced upon him, he saw how hopeless the cause of the Stuarts was, and advocated complete submission to the reigning family."

The only other particulars which have been preserved of Mr Gleig's early life are that, "in his boyhood, he was an excellent horseman, which he continued to be till old age;" and that "he had one brother, who went to Jamaica as a planter about the same time that Mr Gleig was ordained, and died there soon afterwards."

If Mr Gleig entered the University as early in life as his son believes, he must have left it, or at least have taken his degree, several years before he was ordained. How he spent the interval, and where, and with whom he read for orders, is not known. All that we know is, that he read to some purpose. "He gave himself up for a while to the careful study of theology, and a severe course of patristic reading."—*(Encyclopædia Brit.)*

He was ordained in 1773,* and was appointed almost immediately to the charge of Pittenweem, or Crail and Pittenweem.

The poorest Church has generally some charges which, if not lucrative, are yet very eligible. Mr Gleig, it appears to us, was very fortunate in both the charges which he held. They were especially eligible as regards situation and society. Pittenweem, on the north shore of the Firth of Forth, at an easy distance from Edinburgh, surrounded by the seats of old families mostly members of his own

* Just 200 years after the ordination of Richard Hooker.

congregation, and generally resident all the year round, had great advantages in these respects.

It was especially suitable as a first charge to a man of Gleig's varied tastes and capacities. It presented every facility for the development of his powers, both as a pastor and a man of letters. He had free intercourse with all classes of society, easy access to well-stocked libraries, and abundant leisure and retirement for study. The consequence was that he soon became successful and popular as a clergyman, and also distinguished in literature.

"I was taken," says his son, "as a child, early in the century, to Crail for sea-bathing, and remember the heartiness with which they all received and greeted at their houses their former pastor." "He early conceived," he adds, "a great taste for literature. When incumbent of Crail, he contributed to the *Monthly Review*, at that time a leading periodical, edited by Gifford, some of whose letters are still in existence." "His parishioners at Crail consisted of the oldest Fifeshire families, few in number, and their servants," including "The Earl of Kelly, Sir John Sinclair, Mr Hamilton of Kilbrackmont (one of whose daughters he afterwards married), Mr Lindsay of Balcarres, and others."

Of course there were drawbacks, for it was yet nearly twenty years to the repeal of the Penal Laws. "In 1773, the fury of persecution was past; but the Episcopalians conducted their services under difficulties, and subject to many annoyances." The chief difficulty for Mr Gleig and his people was the want of a proper church, and the impossibility of erecting one in face of the stringent enactments of the Penal Laws. To build a church to hold a congregation, when by law the clergyman was prohibited from officiating to more than four persons (in addition to

his own family), would have been to defy the law and court persecution. The only possible course was to officiate in some "large upper room" or other part of a dwelling-house, or in a barn or shed, or any other building which was generally used for some other purpose. This was what Mr Gleig did during his whole incumbency. The church at Crail had been burnt down by the military in 1746, and, of course, had never been rebuilt. The "meeting house" at Pittenweem had been spared, because it was really no church or separate building at all, but literally an "upper room" in a dwelling-house in the town, which could not be destroyed without involving in its destruction valuable private property. Had it been a self-contained and separate building in the street, the congregation would, no doubt, have been compelled, at the point of the bayonet, as the Peterhead congregation was,* to pay workmen to pull down their own church. As it was, they appear, from entries in the Church Account Book, to have got off with the payment of some small charges for repairs, and for "watching the meeting-house windows." In the notices of his life, Mr Gleig is generally spoken of as Incumbent of Crail; and it appears that Crail was at this time, and even as late as 1805, regarded as the principal charge of the two; but the burning of its church was really the ruin of Crail as a separate charge. Mr Gleig made Pittenweem his headquarters, and had service at Crail only every third Sunday. This occasional service was continued by his successors till the erection of a regular church for the churchmen of both charges at

* "The Chappell of Peterhead was destroyed the seventh, eighth, and ninth days of May 1746, and the Managers were obliged to employ workmen and pay them, in order to prevent its being sett on fire, which would endanger burning the town. It was done by Lord Ancrum (Lieutenant-Colonel of Lord Mark Keir's Dragoons), who was at the entering of the people to work."—Note in Minute Book of St Peter's, Peterhead.

Pittenweem in 1805, when service ceased altogether to be held at Crail. Of course, till the Penal Laws were repealed, the erection of a church could not be thought of;* and thus Mr Gleig, however zealous he might be, could do little during his incumbency to improve the church accommodation of his flock.

On Mr Gleig's settlement, there was a great and sudden rise in the Pittenweem subscriptions for the clergyman's salary. So far back as 1726,† the date of the first entry in the Pittenweem Chapel cash book, there is a list of subscribers who "had oblidged y^m^selves to pay" the clergyman, Mr Carstairs, "25 lbs. sterl. per annum." But this sum was with difficulty kept up, and when the dark days of persecution returned, it fell to a third part of that sum. In 1765, "the whole subscriptions amounted only to £8 ,, 3s." For a considerable time after they "fluctuated between £15 and £10;" but in 1772, they had again fallen to £8 ,, 3s. Next year was that of Mr Gleig's appointment, and the subscriptions rose at once to £30.

This sum did not include any portion of the Communion or ordinary weekly offertories, of which, no doubt, a part was assigned to the clergyman; and these more regular sources of ecclesiastical revenue would appear to have been proportionately more productive than the subscription list. Mr Blatch shows that a wonderful amount of support was granted from these sources to the poorer members of the Church, even when the congregational funds were at the lowest ebb. The Pittenweem people evidently gave of

* Not till 1795 was there a church "separate from a dwelling-place" in the town of Aberdeen, and to this want and "the danger of legal interruption" Stephen attributes the fact that Bishop Kilgour held the consecration of his coadjutor, John Skinner (1784), "in the remote chapel of Luthermuir, not far from Laurencekirk," which, being in a secluded place, "had probably escaped the notice of the Duke of Cumberland's army during the reign of military law, and therefore had not been burnt or dilapidated."

† See Blatch's Bishop Low (p. 24, *et seqq.*), for many interesting details.

their substance as freely as most people, and Mr Gleig's salary, though it may sound small in these days, was then above, rather than below the average. And as he continued a bachelor all the time he occupied the Pittenweem charge, he probably found no very great difficulty in making ends meet.

It has been already stated that during his first incumbency Mr Gleig contributed to the *Monthly Review*. He appears also, at one period or other, to have been an occasional contributor to at least three other London periodicals—*The Gentleman's Magazine*, *The British Critic*, and the *Anti-Jacobin Review*. He wrote reviews of theological and philosophical works, and letters in defence of his own Church and its doctrines. His letters did excellent service, for there was at that time great need for a competent Scotch correspondent for the English periodicals. The great majority of Englishmen at that time, even among the educated classes, knew nothing whatever of the Scotch Episcopal Church, and few of those who did, could, from their Church and State habits of thought, realise its position and claims. Those who were aware of the penal laws in force against the Church, probably believed that those laws had already quite crushed the life out of it. Anyhow, it appears to have been almost forgotten, when, by a rather bold step, it for once asserted itself. The little outlawed Church did what the great Established Church of England, through its long day of power and opportunity, had never done; it consecrated a Bishop for America. This was done at Aberdeen, in the "large upper room" which constituted the Longacre Chapel (Nov. 14th, 1784), by the three Aberdeenshire Bishops—Kilgour, Skinner, and Petrie. The effect of this act on the Consecrating Church was to draw all eyes

on it, and excite an interest in its fortunes by some who had power to relieve it. Of course, the act was very differently regarded by different Church parties. In England, the High Church party alone decidedly approved of it.

In the March number of the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1785, a correspondent of a very Erastian cast of mind, who signed himself L. L., made it the subject of a fierce attack. Mr Gleig answered him in the June number of the magazine (vol. lv., p.p. 437-40), under the signature of "An Episcopal Clergyman of the Scotch Church." L. L. rejoined, and so the controversy went on between the two for months;* the letters being afterwards re-published in a collected form by Mr Gleig. Mr Gleig's first letter was honoured by a very flattering notice by the Editor of the Magazine, who wrote, in a foot-note—"We think the correspondence of this learned writer an honour, and shall be happy in the continuance of it—*Sit anima nostra cum suâ.*" The letter was indeed a very creditable production, both as to matter and manner—thoroughly to the point, temperate, courteous, and in style clear, natural, and forcible. It is thus that Mr Gleig disposes of L. L.'s great argument from "the laws of Scotland."

"'The Laws of Scotland,' however," says your correspondent, "have excluded all Episcopacy," and, therefore, he seems to think that there can be now no Bishop on the north of the Tweed. But if the office of a Bishop was instituted by the Apostles, and that it *was*, the Scotch non-jurors think there is abundant evidence, I am humbly of opinion that it cannot be excluded by any human legislature; nor do I think that any power inherent in the office can be taken away by any authority, but that by which it was originally given. The Scotch Convention

* Till September 1786.

which voted Episcopacy a grievance might likewise have voted Christianity a grievance, and have established the religion of Mahomet in its stead; but Christianity would not, in consequence of that vote, have become false, nor Ishmaelitism a true religion; an Act of Convention could not have made the Bible a collection of fables, nor the fictions of the Koran the truths of God. At the Revolution, the Scotch Bishops were deprived of their titles of honour, and of all *legal* jurisdiction, by an Act of Parliament, and for that deprivation an Act of Parliament was certainly competent; but the powers of preaching, of administering the sacraments, and of "sending labourers into Christ's vineyard, as they were received from no *human* authority, by no human authority could they be taken away, &c., &c."

What he says regarding the most recent State attempt to "exclude" Episcopacy from Scotland—the exterminating Penal Law of 1748—is important as a witness not only to the evil effects of that law, but also to the general decay of Jacobitism amongst his fellow-churchmen.

"That the framers of the law enacted in 1748 meant well, I shall not controvert; but the consequences of that law have *not* been beneficial. It was, no doubt, intended to crush disaffection to the Government, but I know nothing which it has really crushed but *religion*, as it has driven out of the Episcopal Church many persons of consequence, whose principles or prejudices will not allow them to communicate with another. At the period when it was enacted, the species of disaffection, which it was meant to eradicate, was not confined to *one* denomination of Christians; at present it has hardly a place among *any*; and the little that may remain among a very few old people, an event daily to be expected, will certainly banish."

There can be little doubt but that this statement as to the decline of Jacobite feeling is substantially correct. The Church, as a body, had become weary of its long and barren witness for the Stuarts, and was ready to welcome the "daily expected" demise of Prince Charles as a relief. Still, some of the leading men do not appear to have been as yet prepared for complete submission, but rather disposed to stand out for inadmissible terms, and to them it is probable that this outspoken admission was not altogether palatable. This offence, however, if offence it was, would, had it stood alone, have been soon forgotten; but, unfortunately for the Church, if not for himself, Mr Gleig animadverted rather strongly on the consecration sermon of Bishop Skinner, who was then all-powerful in the Church. The sermon had given offence to some of the Church's friends in England (Annals of Scot. Episc., p. 61, &c.), and Mr Gleig asserted that "some parts of it were as little approved by the generality of Episcopalians in Scotland as they could be by those in England."* In a subsequent number of the magazine, he writes not to defend the sermon, but the doctrines taught in it. After noticing some attacks upon it, he says, "From all this I would not have any one to imagine that I intend a panegyric on the sermon; I intend not even to attempt a defence of it. It contains many things against which the most solid objections lie; and in unity of subject and perspicuity of style, which, to a pulpit essay, are perhaps more essential than to any other species of composition, it is so miserably deficient, that although I have read it again and again with the closest attention, I can only hazard a probable conjecture what are the main doctrines which its author means to inculcate." He then proceeds

* *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1785, pt. 1st, p. 438.

to sketch out what "seem to be the three great points which the right reverend preacher labours to establish;" which three points he goes on to prove.

It is impossible to deny that this criticism, as regards the style of the sermon at least, is in the main just. The sermon was probably hastily got up, and certainly it is deficient "in unity of subject and perspicuity of style," its great length (50 pages) aggravating its deficiency in these cardinal requirements. But however just the criticism was, it was rather uncalled for, and would have been well forborne. The sermon was merely a fugitive production, and the Church was too small a body to admit of free criticism of each other by its leading men in such secondary matters as style and manner. It will be seen in the next chapter that this critique probably cost Mr Glaig twenty-two years' exclusion from the Episcopate!

CHAPTER II.—1786-7.

Turning point in his History—Is unanimously Elected to the See of Dunkeld—Sends a Tardy and Hesitating Acceptance—Bishop Skinner opposes the Confirmation of the Election—Recalls his Acceptance—Cause of Bishop Skinner's Opposition—Mr Gleig's Trenchant Criticism of the Bishop's Seabury Consecration Sermon—Offends Bishop Skinner a Second Time—Seems to counter-work him in high places in London—Goes to London (1786), *and obtains from Archbishop Moore the Draft of a favourable Bill—Draft not acceptable to Bishops—Bishop Skinner Endeavours to obtain a Bill giving relief without requiring prayer for the King by Name—Mr Gleig communicates to Archbishop the Nature of this Proposed Bill—Consequent Collapse of Attempt—Probable Misconstruction of Mr Gleig's Motives—How it was that Bishop Skinner could keep Mr Gleig so long out of the Episcopate—Deficiency of Law—Party and Personal Prejudices—Church Parties—Cross Divisions.*

We have now reached an era in the life of Mr Gleig. He was as yet only thirty-three; but had promotion had its free course, he would this year have obtained a seat in the Episcopal College, where there was great need of a second able and energetic Bishop, especially one having southern sympathies and affinities, and duly alive to the inevitable tendencies of the time. It was early in life to have such an offer of promotion; but amongst the forty or fifty Presbyters of the poor and down-trodden Church, there was but small choice for the Episcopate. Mr Gleig was indeed marked out for early promotion by the posses-

sion of superior learning, great abilities, and general fitness; and had the unanimous choice of a diocese been sufficient to secure promotion, he would have been promoted now.

Bishop Rose having resigned the diocese of Dunkeld, the clergy of that see elected first Dr Abernethy Drummond, and then, on his declining, Mr Lyall, one of their own number; and when he also declined,* they unanimously elected Mr Gleig, Nov. 9, 1786.

In communicating to Mr Gleig the intelligence of his election, the clergy wrote as follows:—"We hereby earnestly beseech you will accept, by which you will not only very much oblige us, but also, upon your promotion, you will find all canonical obedience paid you with readiness and cheerfulness."

Mr Gleig, after considerable delay, sent a hesitating and reluctant acceptance. Here is part of his letter:—"My Reverend and Dear Brethren,—The time has long elapsed at which you had reason to expect my final answer respecting my acceptance of that high and sacred office to which I have the honour to be chosen by your unanimous suffrages. For this delay I can plead no other apology than the fluctuating state of my own mind, which resolved upon one thing to-day, and changed that resolution on the morrow. . . . . The importunities of my too partial friends have prevailed, and I have reluctantly resolved to acquiesce in your election, of which, I pray God, you may never have cause to repent. Indeed, so low is my opinion of my fitness for so weighty a charge, and so little is my ambition of being a ruler in the Church, that I

* Mr Lyall had an excellent excuse, "one foot in the grave, and the other fast following it." Dr Drummond assigns no reason for his declinature, but it may be gathered from his answer that the hostility of the Bishops had something to do with it.

shall even yet think myself released from a very heavy burden if you will be so good as transfer your suffrages to another."*

This *Nolo Episcopari* was no doubt perfectly genuine. Mr Gleig lived to give further proofs of it. But it is one thing to wish to decline, and another to be forbidden to accept. The latter was, in the end, Mr Gleig's case, as may be seen from the following extract from the Minute Book of Dunkeld Diocese.

"A copy of this letter was sent to the Primus (Kilgour), and he signified, in a private letter to the Dean, his approbation of the Clergy's choice. But, in the meantime, Bishop Skinner, of Aberdeen, having objected to Mr Gleig's promotion, on account of some expressions in a late publication of his, entitled 'An Apology for the Church of Scotland,' inserted in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Mr Gleig wrote a letter to the clergy, recalling his acceptance, from which the following is an extract:—'Pittenweem, Monday in Easter Week, 1787.—My dear and Reverend Brethren,—You probably know, in consequence of a letter of mine in answer to one from your Dean, that objections were unexpectedly started to my promotion by Bishop Skinner. Although many letters have passed between his reverence, the Primus, and myself on the subject, I do not even yet know what these objections are. But as I am conscious of my own unworthiness, as the Bishop seems extremely averse to receiving me as his colleague, and as the Episcopate is an honour of which I never was ambitious, and which I should feel a very heavy burden, you will have the goodness to accept my resignation of all claims to the dignity to which your partial suffrages have elected me. I entreat you to be as-

* See the whole of this letter, with the accompanying documents.—Neale's Torry, pp. 59, 60, &c.

sured, that while I live, I shall ever retain a grateful sense of the honour done me by the Diocese of Dunkeld, and that the sole reason of my resignation is to prevent disturbance on my account in this miserable and afflicted Church.'"

The publication that contained the offending "remarks" was the reprint of Mr Gleig's controversy with L.L., already referred to, entitled "Letters containing an Apology for the Episcopal Church of Scotland." The pamphlet, besides a great many notes, contained an additional letter by the Rev. J. K., Rector of L——, and it extended to 136 pages.*

The writer has not seen the reprint; but there can be no doubt that the "remarks" which gave offence to Bishop Skinner were those which have been quoted from Mr Gleig's first and second letters, animadverting on the Seabury Consecration sermon;† or that the sting of the remarks lay in the strictures on the defects of style and arrangement in the sermon. The offence was apparently altogether literary and personal—not ecclesiastical; and thus it could not, in specific terms, be assigned as a reason for refusing to confirm Mr Gleig's election. Hence Mr Gleig wrote the Dunkeld Clergy that, "though many letters had passed between the Primus (Kilgour) and himself, he did not even" then "know what the objections started to his promotion by Bishop Skinner" were. It was quite enough, at that time, however, if Bishop Skinner opposed a man or a measure, whether he did so with or without reason. His word was law. He was not only the ablest and most energetic Bishop in the College; but also the only one in it that was really fit for active duty. All the rest were actually or virtually super-

* *Gentleman's Magazine*, part 1 (1787), p. 332.
† See chapter I., pp. 192-3.

annuated. It was to succeed the retiring Bishop Rose* that Mr Gleig had been elected. Bishop Kilgour had two years previously resigned the diocese of Aberdeen to Bishop Skinner. Bishop Petrie was very near his end, and had for some time back been making urgent application for a coadjutor.

These men were thus all practically *ab agendo;* and they were the whole of Bishop Skinner's colleagues. Without Bishop Skinner's consent and co-operation they could do nothing. Bishop Skinner, therefore, wielded the power of the College, and could thus, by a word, veto the election of the ablest presbyter in the Church, though unanimously elected. And for some time to come his power was strengthened rather than weakened, and he could, within a few years, as will be seen, repeat the high-handed veto. About the time that Mr Gleig forwarded his retractation of his acceptance of the Dunkeld Bishopric, Bishop Petrie obtained a coadjutor—Mr Macfarlane, of Inverness—and died a few weeks afterwards. Now Bishop Macfarlane, as an extreme Hutchinsonian, was favourable to Bishop Skinner, and antagonistic to Mr Gleig.

Some time also, during the course of the year, Mr Gleig had the misfortune to again give Bishop Skinner grievous offence by appearing to counter-work him in his attempts to obtain the Repeal of the Penal Laws.

In this matter Mr Gleig, so far as can be judged, was entirely free from blame; unless it may have been in his *manner* of advocating seasonable, but unpalatable truths. It was his misfortune to be "before his age"—to see sooner than the Bishops the only possible course

* Bishop Rose retired upon the nominal diocese of Dunblane. Bishop Low affirms that he never had more than one Presbyter under him. (See postea chap. xi.); but the remark was surely meant only to apply to the period subsequent to his resignation of the See of Dunkeld.

open to the Church in the matter of the Penal Laws. It was thus inevitable that, with his out-spoken, independent manner, he should come into collision with the Bishops.

In the same year (1786), Mr Gleig attempted, in conjunction, apparently, with other Churchmen (of whom his parishioner, Lord Kellie, was one) to negotiate for the repeal of the Penal Laws. He went to London chiefly, if not entirely, for that purpose. He had already, mainly through his literary reputation, a good many influential friends there, including Dr Berkeley, Sub-Dean of Canterbury, and son of the famous Bishop Berkeley. Through these friends he obtained an introduction to Archbishop Moore, and appears to have procured from him, after consultation with leading Statesmen, the draft of the sort of Relief Bill that the Government would assent to. This was a better bill than was finally obtained, after six years expensive and troublesome negotiation. The Bishops, however, were not prepared to accept such a bill at that time; and they proceeded soon afterwards to ask for a measure of Relief not involving the requirement to pray for the King by name. This "foolish attempt," Mr Gleig always believed, ruined their chance of obtaining a favourable bill.* It raised a suspicion against the Bishops and the Church, and was one great cause of the determined opposition of Lord Thurlow,

* "The remembrance of his father's (Bishop Skinner's) conduct to myself upwards of thirty years ago, with which you are well acquainted, and but for which, we should at this moment have had a much more liberal toleration than we have, or are ever likely now to obtain."—Letter of Bishop Gleig to Bishop Torry, Sept. 18th, 1816. Bishop Skinner was conscious of the dissatisfaction with which the Relief Bill was received by many Churchmen, and made a laboured defence of it in his address to the Convention of 1792. The Convention passed a resolution to the effect that he "had obtained the best Bill which, in the present circumstances, could be expected." This was probably true; but a better Bill might possibly have been obtained six years earlier.

and the consequent clogging of the Relief Bill with the Disabilities Clause, which stuck to the Clergy for seventy years.

But let us hear what Mr Gleig himself says of this matter in a letter to Bishop Torry of August 15, 1817.

"It is the foolish attempt which was made in the years 1786 and 1787, to get an Act of Toleration passed in our favour, without obliging us to pray for the *King by name*. That project originated, as perhaps you know, and I can prove, in some correspondence between the late Bishop Skinner and his father with Mr Boucher, to whom they had been introduced by Bishop Seabury. Mr Boucher, who had been useful on some occasion to one of the *Edens*, brother-in-law to Archbishop Moore, stood well with his Grace, and unfortunately supposed that his interest with him was great. He accordingly seems to have persuaded our two Clergymen that their project was *practicable*, and that the Archbishop of Canterbury would *support it;* and the consequence was, that they communicated it to some of the other Bishops, perhaps to all but Bishop Rose, and to many of the inferior Clergy, of whom I had the honour to be one. The whole project, together with the reasoning by which it was attempted to be made plausible, appeared to all the Edinburgh Clergy, as well as to me, in the highest degree extravagant, and fraught with the utmost danger to the Church; it was likewise so very different from the plan which the Archbishop, Dean, and Vice-Dean of Canterbury had, a few months before, laid down to myself for obtaining a repeal of the Penal Laws, that, after consulting Dr Abernethy Drummond and Mr J. Allan, I detailed it to the Vice-Dean, Dr Berkeley, and requested him to show my letter to the Dean, Dr Horne, and one or other of them to learn *cautiously* from the Archbishop, whether he would support such a measure,

should it ever be attempted to be carried into effect. The consequence was, that the Archbishop severely reproved Mr Boucher for coupling his name with so absurd a project, and also blamed Bishop Skinner's opposition to my promotion to the Episcopate. This, however, was the very least evil that flowed from it. Either Archbishop Moore, or some other person, to whom the extravagant scheme had been communicated, must have communicated it to the Lord Chancellor, Thurlow; for in his speech in opposition to our Act of Toleration, he charges our Clergy, in the very words of old Mr Skinner, with contending that, before the conversion of Constantine the Great, the Christian Clergy did not, in their assemblies, pray for the Roman Emperors *by name*. To this precious project, too, may, perhaps, be attributed the extreme dread of the Archbishop himself, of our Clergy finding their way into the Church of England; for when I saw him at Canterbury, he appeared to have no such dread, being privy to my preaching at Peckham."

It is clear from the answer which Bishop Torry makes to this letter that the part which Mr Gleig acted on this occasion gave, somehow, very great offence to Bishop Skinner. "What you mention," he says, "of the attempt made in 1786 and 1787, explains to me the ground of an expression, which I heard so frequently, that, even now, it is as fresh in my recollection as if I had heard it yesterday. I was then too young to be admitted into any secrets. But I saw that the minds both of Bishop Skinner and his father were galled by some severe disappointment; and the old man particularly was at that time bitter in his resentment against you. The expression which I allude to was, 'that you had sacrificed a Bishop of your own Church on the altar of Canterbury;' the

meaning of which I never understood till now." "It would certainly," Bishop Torry adds, "be the height of imprudence to tell the public that such a hopeless and ill-judged project was ever seriously entertained in the mind of the late Primus, whose character would thereby suffer in the judgment of many."

It was only too natural that Bishop Skinner and his father should have taken offence at Mr Gleig's interference on this occasion, though there can be little doubt but that he did them and the whole Church a service, by nipping in the bud their "hopeless and ill-judged project." The further such a measure was pushed, the more would it have compromised its authors and the Church. It never could have passed, and the ventilation of it might have excited an over-powering prejudice against the suffering Church, and postponed relief indefinitely. Bishop Skinner probably realised this truth, but very faintly at the time; and regarded Mr Gleig as the cause as well as the occasion of the failure of his project. Anyhow, the incident widened the breach between the two men, and strengthened the determination of Bishop Skinner to keep Mr Gleig out of the College. Without doubt, he had the power to keep him out for the next ten, or even the next twenty years.

In order to understand how this could be, it will be necessary to advert briefly to certain divisive influences.

1. *The condition of the Church at the time as regards law, Church parties, and schools.*

2. *The personal qualities of the two men which predisposed them to antagonism.*

1. The reign of law could scarcely be said to prevail in the Church as yet. The few Canons which had been enacted* bore almost entirely on the rights of the Bishops,

* See the XVI. Canons of 1743. Grub IV. 1-17.

and their duties towards one another, singly and collectively. They contained but very scant references to the rights of the Presbyters, and these so vague and incidental, as to be open to great latitude of interpretation. There was, in fact, nothing in the Canons that could put any real restraint either on the power of a Bishop within his own diocese, or on that of the majority of the College in the Church at large. There was no specification of the grounds on which the College might refuse to confirm the election of a Bishop; and, generally, the Bishops seem to have refused, simply on the ground that the Bishop elect was not quite satisfactory to them, or not in their opinion the best man. They acted, in fact, as if they had been a second Chamber of Electors, with much the same right of choice as the first, and with much greater authority and responsibility. Further, by the frequent appointment of coadjutor Bishops—usually the nominees of their principals,—and by the occasional re-arrangement of dioceses, by which an old diocese was enlarged or lessened, or a new diocese formed, the free choice of the Presbyters was yet more encroached upon.* From these various causes the appointment of a Bishop, at this period, really rested more with the Bishops than with the Presbyters; and, in fact, a diocese was as often found for a Bishop, as a Bishop for a diocese. The system worked pretty well in the then circumstances of the Church; but it was liable to abuse even in the best hands, especially when party and personal prejudices came into play.

2. Party prejudices prevailed at this time to a much greater extent than is generally supposed. The Church was very far from being a perfectly united and homogeneous body. It contained two pretty distinct parties—

* See (chap. xii.) a striking letter on this subject by Bishop Torry.

a Northern and a Southern,—though the latter was as yet but small. The Northern party in general held firmly by the principles of the English Non-jurors, and in matters of ritual, deviated considerably from the English Book of Common Prayer. The Southern party held generally the views of the then English High Church party, and in worship, aimed at conformity with England, and uniformity at home. In the great practical question of the time, how to obtain relief from the Penal Laws, the Southerns generally advocated unconditional submission to the Government, the Northerns generally stood out for terms, such as exemption from the duty of praying for the King by name.

Besides these two regular parties, there were certain cross divisions, neither running on the regular Church lines, nor yet confined altogether to Church limits; in short, semi-metaphysical schools rather than ecclesiastical parties, such as the Hutchinsonians in the North, and the Quasi-Pelagians in the South.

Most of the Clergy in the North, especially in the diocese of Aberdeen,* were Hutchinsonian, and some of them, such as Bishop Macfarlane and the famous John Skinner of Linshart, appeared not only to reject the Newtonian philosophy, but also to deny some received definitions of the faith, such as the Eternal Generation of the Son. Mr Gleig and some other of the Edinburgh Clergy, in their violent antagonism to Calvinism, ran into

* The late Dr Pratt, of Cruden, assured the writer that the Clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen were all Hutchinsonian when he was ordained (in 1820). He used to give an amusing account of the way in which he, when a young man about to take orders, was catechised by Dean Saugster as to his reading. Had he read the works of Hickes? No. Of Brett? No. Of Johnson of Cranbrook? No. These no's greatly shocked the good man; but he lost all patience when he received another no, in answer to the crucial question, "Well, sir, have you read the works of John Hutchinson Esquire?"

a sort of Pelagianism, or at least made use of language which savoured of certain Pelagian doctrines, and laid them open to a charge of Pelagianism.

In those days there was considerable latitude for speculation on certain of the deeper mysteries of the faith, the Clergy not being bound to subscribe the XXXIX. Articles. Speculation, however, appears to have produced but very little effect on the practice, the worship, or the general belief of even the boldest speculators in the Church. The only appreciable results were the occasional interruption of harmony, a want of ready sympathy and co-operation between the different theological schools, frequent complaints of the violence of party spirit,* and now and then a somewhat high-handed action.

It must be observed that on every one of these questions that divided the Church, Bishop Skinner and Mr Gleig were ranged on opposite sides. But perhaps no views or principles tended to divide them so much as their personal characteristics. Both were born to command, and neither of them was very patient of opposition or contradiction. The Bishop, like most Bishops of those days, was very sensitive to public criticism of his words and of his Episcopal acts, especially by members of his own Church; the Presbyter was a watchful and trenchant critic, who had the ear of the ecclesiastical public both in Scotland and England, and who, in his critical capacity, was no great respecter of persons.

The reader must now see that the men and the times being what they were, a misunderstanding was almost certain to arise between the able Bishop and the able Presbyter, and if it did arise, the Presbyter was sure to suffer. He was placed at a great disadvantage, and however good his cause might be, it was of little use to "argue"

* E.g.—By Bishop Macfarlane on one side, and Mr Gleig on the other.

it "with the Master of" an Episcopal College. He had not only prejudice and prepossession, but also power against him.

Thus Bishop Skinner's influence was quite sufficient to keep Mr Gleig out of the Episcopal College. And that influence chiefly, if not solely, did keep him out during the best years of his life—years of trial for the Church—during which it had pressing need of the best services of its best men. The Penal Laws Repeal Bill, and the gathering in of the separated congregations, were measures of primary importance which, notwithstanding the zeal of their chief promoters, were very slowly, and, after all, but imperfectly accomplished. Mr Gleig, with his literary talent and Anglican sympathies, could, in high position, have greatly helped forward both. Even those who are readiest to admit the great merits of Bishop Skinner will probably agree that it would have been well, both for him and for the Church, that he had had, at this time, as colleague an equally able Southern Bishop. The Bishop himself would probably have admitted as much twenty years later, when Mr Gleig had at last become his colleague, and on the whole, co-operated very harmoniously with him. The Church, indeed, was the chief loser by this summary rejection. The Clergy of Dunkeld remained without a Bishop five years longer, and showed by their action at the end of that period that they had not forgotten the treatment which they had received. Mr Gleig turned his thoughts from general Church affairs to literature, which for the next twenty years was not only a solace for professional disappointments, but also, probably, his chief source of pecuniary support. He was perhaps the only clergyman in the Church at that time who could have supported himself by his pen.

CHAPTER III.—1787-1792.

Removes to Stirling—Advantages of place—Situation—Society—Condition of Charge—Church, Congregation, Residence—Literary pursuits—Marriage—First Laurencekirk Convention—Letter to Mr Torry—Account of his Contributions to "Encyclopædia Britannica"—Metaphysics—Passing of Relief Bill—Backwardness of Clergy in complying with requirements of Bill—Edinburgh Clergy and Original Sin—Is again unanimously elected Bishop of Dunkeld, and again "rejected."

TOWARDS the close of this, to him eventful, year 1787, Mr Gleig was appointed to the charge at Stirling, and resigned that of Pittenweem, which he had now held for fourteen years. He soon removed to Stirling, which, for fifty-three long years, continued his home, and the sphere of his immediate duties. And for him, scholarly and literary as he was, this final settlement at Stirling was certainly a most happy event.

For one thing, the lines had fallen to him in a very pleasant place. Situated in the centre of Scotland, in the natural pass between North and South, and sheltered from the East and the North by the lofty Ochills and Grampians, Stirling is pre-eminent among Scotch towns for scenery, for historical associations, for salubrity of climate, and for easy intercommunication with the chief cities, and the most interesting localities of Scotland. It has almost every natural advantage.

At that time it had also, it appears, in a high degree, the advantage of intellectual and well cultured society.

"There was excellent literary society in Stirling when he was there. Dr Doig, the Headmaster of the Grammar School, was an admirable classic. Mr Ramsay of Ochtertyre, a great antiquary, the prototype indeed, in some respects, of Scott's Antiquary. Mr Moir* of Leckie, Mr Graham of Micklewood, Sir William Stuart of Allanton, and Lord Woodhouselee were members of this select body. They used to meet from time to time, and hold literary and scientific discussions."†

Thus there was much in and around Stirling to stimulate and foster the intellectual energies of Mr Gleig. And then Edinburgh, the great literary centre of the North—"the second city in the Empire for learning and science"‡—at that time fast growing in importance, was near; and Glasgow was nearer still.

But after all, to Mr Gleig, the chief object of interest in Stirling was the Church—the humble charge which he had just come to fill. Of the whole condition of that charge then and for more than ten years after, his son, the late Chaplain-General, gives a full and particular and most graphic account, which is interesting, not only in connection with the life of Mr Gleig, but also as illustrating the general condition of the Church and society at an important and picturesque transitional period.

This is what he says of the state of the congregation previous to Mr Gleig's settlement in Stirling:—"The

* Mr Moir is described as "a devout Jacobite" (Conolly's Bishop Low, p. 138.) He was also something of a humourist, and his humour naturally savoured of Jacobitism. He acquired the Estate of Leckie by marriage, and he used to point to his own small Patrimonial estate—at some distance from Leckie—and say "Yon's my Hanover!" Sir W. Stuart published an *édition de luxe* of Sallust See postea, chap. V. The literary talent of the Woodhouselee family (Tytler) is well known. Lord Woodhouselee was the author of "Elements of General History," &c. His son, Patrick Fraser Tytler, wrote the "History of Scotland," "Scottish Worthies," "Life of Raleigh," &c.

† Letter of the late Chaplain-General to Writer.

‡ Cockburn's Memorials, p. 213.

Stirling congregation was so far broken up by the Penal Laws that for many years after 1746 there was no place wherein worship was performed to the general public. The clergyman, I think his name was Skene, used to go by stealth to the houses of his flock, and administer to them the Holy Sacrament at the risk of being arrested, imprisoned, transported. . . . One of the houses in which these furtive services used to be held was Murray's Hall. I think that another family, which inhabited a house near the Flesh Market which has a circular staircase or turret in front of it, was in the habit of thus receiving Mr Skene."* The latter was, it seems, the regular place of meeting when Mr Gleig went to Stirling. "There was no regular church at Stirling when Mr Gleig went there. The congregation used to assemble in a room which formed part of an old turreted house,† adjoining to what was then the 'Flesh Market,' but is now the High School of Stirling. It was not an 'upper,' but a lower room, for you descended to it by a flight of steps, the house standing on the edge of a declivity, and having, therefore, a greater number of stories in rear than in front.

"I think I see the room‡ while I write to you. It

* Letter to Clergyman at Stirling printed in *Trinity Church Magazine*, Feb. 1872.

† The house still stands, it appears. "The Scottish congregation met in an old house in Broad Street, bearing the motto, 'Nisi Dominus frustra.' It is now altered; but a man tells me he remembers the room which was used as a church. It was about 30 feet long, and was divided into five compartments, with glass sashes, holding four or five each, so that the clergyman might keep within the letter of the law, forbidding more than five persons to meet for service."—Letter from the Rev. Clement Lee Coldwell, April 30, 1875, to Writer.

‡ Mr Gleig had doubtless often seen the room after it had ceased to be the regular place of meeting. The room may also have been used for occasional service, or for other congregational purposes, after the regular church was built. The latter building was begun in 1795, and certainly completed in 1798. Mr Gleig was born in 1796. In another communication he says, "I fancy that I remember being carried as a child to that room, &c."

was large, low, and somewhat dark, being lighted by windows only on one side. A little space railed in at one end enclosed the altar, and one tribune served for both reading-desk and pulpit. The congregation numbered about 50 people, and consisted of county families and about 20 poor persons, some of them emigrants from the Highlands. There were also two or three old ladies, Jacobites to the heart's core, who, long after the regular church was built, continued as often as the Royal Family were prayed for to shut their books with a slam, rise from their knees, and yawn audibly.* The members of that little congregation clung to one another as if they had belonged to the same family. They were particularly attentive to their pastor, making him constant presents of fruit, game, and, if I recollect right, occasionally wine.

"Mr Gleig, when first inducted into the cure at Stirling, resided in the Baker's Wynd, now called Baker Street. The house which he occupied belonged to a baker called Sawers, a most respectable man, whose shop comprised the whole of the lowest flat. For in those days the habit was as common in Scotland as in France for gentlemen who lived in town to live in flats; and the house in which I was born consisted of two flats and the garrets. Subsequently, in 1800 or 1802, Mr Gleig purchased a house before it was completed, in Bridge Street, which the builder finished under his directions, and in which he lived to the day of his death. It was a very comfortable, unpretending edifice, on the outskirts of the town, and commanding from the windows in the rear one of the most beautiful views in Scotland—the valley of the

* Compare this account with the following:—"Well do I remember the day on which the name of George was mentioned in the Morning Service for the first time: such blowing of noses, such significant hums, such half-suppressed sighs, such smothered groans, and universal confusion can hardly be conceived."—Neale's Torry, p. 12.

Forth, with the ruins of Cambuskenneth Abbey and the Ochills, Lamond and Touch-hills bounding it on every side."*

We see how low, through the long-continued pressure of the Penal Laws, the native Episcopal cause had fallen in Stirling! how scant the numbers, how humble the outward machinery, and the worldly environments! It was much the same in most Scotch towns, especially those in the South.† The wealth, the rank, and the numbers mostly sought the safe precincts of the qualified chapel. But who can doubt that the fervid zeal and the sturdy principle were to be found chiefly in the humble "upper" or lower "room"—in the small flocks, where "the members clung to one another as if they had belonged to the same family;" and the ladies "slammed their prayer-books," and "yawned audibly" at the prayer for King George? Mr Gleig suffered from the proximity of a qualified chapel in Stirling till 1804, when all the requirements of the Repeal Bill were complied with by the Church. Nevertheless, under his fostering care, his small

* Letter to writer, Nov. 23, 1874.

† A very interesting question was raised about this time, and rather acrimoniously discussed in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, viz., What were the relative numbers of the English and Scotch, or the Non-juring and the "qualified" Episcopalians? No statistics were supplied, however, for a satisfactory decision of the question. But from all that can be learned upon the subject now, it may be concluded that the numbers were not far from equal. In *numbers* the Scotch congregations were about double the English (48 to 24); but in size, the English were probably rather more than double the Scotch. The whole Episcopalians of both classes did not, it may be safely assumed, number more than from twenty to twenty-five thousand souls—a small fraction of the population of the country. Is the fraction larger now? Most probably not, especially if we count only Episcopalians of native birth. In the diocese of Aberdeen the proportion is doubtless less; nay, the actual numbers are probably less. See Bishop Jolly, chapter ii., p. 27. The true condition of the Church as to numbers may be somewhat difficult to ascertain even now. And if exactly known, some false inferences might possibly be drawn from it. But, on the whole, more good than evil must always result from the exact knowledge of the truth. The Church must know better what to do, and what *not* to do. Truth is the safest guide.

flock grew and multiplied till, in no great length of time, it had doubled itself. But a congregation of fifty, or of twice fifty, mostly resident in a small town, could furnish no adequate scope for the energies of such a man. From the higher and wider sphere of Church work he had been shut out. Unless, therefore, he was to let his great powers run to waste, he must seek out for himself some additional field of labour. Literature was his only resource. To literature, therefore, he now devoted himself more and more. In addition to his frequent contributions to the English periodicals, he in the year 1788 became a regular and very voluminous contributor to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the third edition of which began to be issued about that time. The year following (1789) Mr Gleig married. The lady, who was said to be possessed of great personal charms, was "Janet, the youngest daughter of Robert Hamilton of Kilbrackmont, and widow of Dr Fullton." She continued a congenial helpmeet to her husband for five and thirty years, and bore him four children, "three sons and one daughter. The eldest son died in infancy. The second entered the Indian Army in 1810, and died of cholera during the war with the Mahrattas in 1818. The daughter married Archdeacon Bailey of Colombo, and died in 1838, leaving one son and a daughter. The youngest son, after keeping six terms at Oxford, entered the army in 1812, served in the Peninsula and in America, and in 1818 returned to Oxford, took his degree, and was ordained in 1819."†

Though excluded from power, Mr Gleig could not be divested of influence. To his suggestion may be distinctly traced the adoption of a most necessary measure for facilitating the passage of a Repeal Bill.

† Letter to writer from Chaplain-General, 1874.

The Bishops had just failed (July 1789) in their attempt to pass a bill. They had acted alone; not associating with them any representatives of the other clergy, or of the laity. The business, however, was of far too serious a nature to be settled satisfactorily by any one Order of men in the Church. The Bishops appear to have come to see this themselves. It may be doubted, however, whether they would have thrown themselves so soon as they did upon the whole Church, had they not been stimulated from without. The stimulus came from an inmate of Mr Gleig's house, and was no doubt more or less prompted by Mr Gleig. Mr George Monck Berkeley, a son of Mr Gleig's friend, Dr Berkeley, canon of Canterbury, being in delicate health, came to live with Mr Gleig at Stirling. When the Bishops' attempt failed, this gentleman circulated an address "To the Clerical and Lay Members of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland," suggesting "the propriety of a second application to Parliament," and proposing "a plan of procedure."

The plan was—"That each of the two orders (presbyters and laymen) should elect a representative to superintend, on its behalf, the next application to Parliament for a repeal" of the Penal Laws.

2. To direct the attention of the inferior clergy to the preservation of their own rights, &c.

He added, "That the Bishops undertook their embassy without the concurrence of the clergy and laity over whom they preside; that they constituted themselves sole and absolute governors of the Church in Scotland; that they concerted measures for the relief of the Church without the advice or approbation of the inferior clergy, who with themselves were equally interested in the success of these measures; and that they have plainly evinced their utter

incapacity to execute their own plans, are facts I need not call to your recollection," &c.

The author of the "Annals of Scottish Episcopacy," after quoting the address at length, adds, "The Primus had previously meant to assemble a convention of the Church, to be composed of all the clergy, with a lay delegate or delegates from every congregation . . . ; and the above paper determined him to assemble it without delay."

Hence the first Laurencekirk Convention, the chief result of which was the appointment of a Committee "with full power to manage and carry on the measures still held necessary for obtaining a repeal of the penal statutes, which Committee should consist of three Bishops, three Presbyters, and three Lay persons." This was all, and more than all, that Mr Berkeley had suggested. Mr Gleig was one of the three Presbyters appointed.

From this time onwards we have light thrown upon Mr Gleig's history from one of the best of all sources—his own private letters.

In the year 1790, Mr (afterwards Bishop) Torry wrote to Mr Gleig, offering to wait upon him (on his way to or from Edinburgh), and return to him the letters which he had written to the late Bishop Kilgour, Mr Torry's father-in-law. Mr Gleig replied, thanking Mr Torry warmly, and inviting him to stay some time with him at Stirling. This was the commencement of a friendship which appears to have subsisted for fifty years without break or coolness, and was only terminated by death. To it we owe many letters of much interest and value.

Next year, in answer to a letter from Mr Torry, Mr Gleig writes that gentleman a letter containing a full and particular account of his chief literary labours during the three last years.

"Stirling, Oct. 7th, 1791.—You are very good to suppose me *capable* of instructing the public; but though my opinion of my own talents is perhaps as high as it should be, I am far from thinking of them as you profess to do in the letter which is now before me. I am, however, anything but idle; and since it will gratify you to know upon what subjects I am employed, I shall tell you what I have lately done, and what I am now doing. Besides the task of occasional sermon writing, which, being part of my duty, I hope shall always, when necessary, have place of my voluntary pursuits, I have within the compass of these three last years written for the *Encyclopœdia Britannica* the following articles:—1, *Episcopacy;* 2, *Grammar;* 3, *Instinct;* 4, *The Life of Dr Johnson;* 5, *An Inquiry into the Origin of Language;* 6, *Large Additions to the former system of Logic;* and I am at this moment engaged in *Metaphysics*, of which about one-half is written. For great part of the article *Episcopacy* I was indebted to the sermon preached by Dr Berkeley at the consecration of Bishop Horne, which, appearing to me a very conclusive piece of reasoning, I adapted, with the author's consent, because I thought the arguments would have more weight as coming from him than from an author without a name. In the enquiry into the *origin* of *language*, I was much indebted to some hints from Mr Skinner;* not that I have followed, or from the nature of the work could follow, the plan sketched out by him; but by a different road I arrived at a conclusion, which I should be sorry if he did not approve. In the other articles I have had no assistance but from books, of

* Rev. John Skinner, Longside, father of Bishop Skinner. Mr Gleig had a very high opinion of Mr Skinner's abilities, and in spite of occasional differences of view, continued in friendly terms with him to the last. They had much learned correspondence on the subject of articles for the *Encyclopædia*. See Memoir of Mr Skinner by his son, p. lxiii., *et seqq.*—Theological Works, Vol. I.

which you may believe I have read many and looked into more The article *Metaphysics* will be a long treatise comprehending a vast variety of subjects, and of intricate reasonings; but as I shall differ very widely, and without ceremony, from some popular metaphysicians in this country, I should not much wish to be known for the author, at least for some years to come. The Grammar, which some time or other I mean to republish in a different form, is likewise of some length; but it is not so well arranged as it might have been, because Dr Gregory and some other writers, whose opinions I controvert, had not published till after the whole article was written. I was therefore under the necessity of either passing these opinions unnoticed, writing the whole article over, or engrafting what I had to say in the best manner that I could on my former composition. Of the three alternatives, I adopted the last, as I had neither time nor inclination for the second, and the first would have been unjust to the purchasers of the *Encyclopœdia*. Hence, many things are stated in *notes* which would have appeared with more propriety in the *text*, and hence, too, some of the notes are of very uncommon length. The analysis of the relative pronoun I have never met with in print, and the account of the modes of verbs are likewise to me original. I know that to many these disquisitions will appear by much too subtle; but he who likes not subtle disquisitions should content himself with the plain rules of every grammar, without enquiring into the *why* or the *wherefore*. . . . I suppose your new chapel is finished and opened. Mine is not begun to be built, and will probably never be begun unless the Penal Laws be repealed, or our present house be blown down by the wind."

The article on Metaphysics referred to in the above

letter was one of two or three, including those on *Instinct* and on *Theology*, which brought Mr Gleig great and lasting credit. The article on Metaphysics extended to 229 double-columned quarto pages, and would have made a considerable volume if published separately. It needs not that the reader should be an expert in Metaphysics in order to appreciate the merits of this article. Clear and forcible statement of the leading metaphysical theories was the first requisite in such an article; and clear and forcible statement was one of Mr Gleig's strong points.

Further it is impossible not to see that the writer is no mere compiler, but a thinker who has revolved the subject thoroughly in his own mind, and has formed views of his own, even on the most abstruse points; and never shrinks from measuring arguments with the greatest metaphysical authorities of the time. All this is obvious to the general reader. But beyond this is the question, to be settled only by competent critics—Was there anything in the writer's views, or in his manner of supporting them, sufficiently original, or striking, to entitle him to rank as a metaphysician? This question, it would seem, received a most decidedly affirmative answer from contemporary critics. The article was so highly appreciated, we are assured, that it was continued, with little alteration, through two or three of the subsequent editions of the *Encyclopædia*. And the writer certainly enjoyed considerable reputation as an authority in metaphysics. "As a metaphysical writer, even in metaphysical Scotland," says Dr Neale, "he enjoyed a considerable reputation." "As a metaphysician he deserves to take rank with Dr Reid and Dugald Stewart."—*Encyclopædia Britannica.* The last estimate is, no doubt, an exaggerated one; but then there can be no just comparison between the native

philosophical capacity of a clergyman who has written only an occasional article on metaphysics, and that of a Professor who has devoted to the study and exposition of the subject the labour of a lifetime. Had Mr Gleig, during his best years, filled a Chair of Moral Philosophy, his contributions to the science of mind would, without doubt, have been incomparably more important, and his name might have stood high on the roll of Scotch metaphysicians.

The article on Metaphysics was (or was believed by the writer of it to be) half-written in 1791; but the volume of the *Encyclopædia* containing it did not appear till 1797. By that time Mr Gleig had written many more articles, and was already probably the leading contributor to the *Encyclopædia*.

In the year after writing this letter (1792), several events happened in the Church which deeply concerned Mr Gleig, but which, in their results, all tended more and more to withdraw him from active interest in Church affairs.

On June 15, a Bill for the repeal of the Penal Laws at last received the Royal assent. It was not such a measure as it might and ought to have been; and it was long before it produced much appreciable effect upon the Church. The laity were, indeed, now quite freed from all restrictions and disabilities. But the clergy, besides being jealously shut out from England, were still left liable to penalties, unless they took the oath of abjuration, and signed the XXXIX. Articles, neither of which things they were, as a body, prepared to do.

The Church thus remained much as it had been for a dozen years to come.

The backwardness of the clergy to sign the XXXIX. Articles formed the chief obstacle to union with the sepa-

rated congregations. It was due mainly to the belief that certain of the Articles were susceptible only of a Calvinistic interpretation. To the majority of the Edinburgh clergy, however, and to Mr Gleig in particular, the IXth. Article was probably a greater obstacle than the XVIIth. According to Mr (afterwards Bishop) Watson, they were at that time very lax on the subject of original sin. "Do ye know that the Allans and the other Edinburgh clergy are already hovering on the confines of Socinianism, expressing, with *great modesty*, their objections to the received doctrine of original sin, as delivered in Bishop Skinner's lectures, and explaining away the pointed phraseology of Scripture concerning it? I speak not from report, but from my own knowledge. Their Bishop is not what he should be as to his ideas to [on] original sin; but he is orthodox and humble compared with Mr Gleig. So little are we hurt by the crime of Adam, that Mr Gleig says he is born with no more taint in his nature than Adam was created with. Ah, Mr Gleig, pride it was that ruined Adam, and beware lest pride ruin you, after Christ has recovered you, for no humble man would say what you have done."*

There can be no doubt but that the Edinburgh clergy *minimised* too much on the doctrine of original sin; and Mr Gleig, who had a great horror of the extreme form of the doctrine—the total depravity of human nature—then very intolerantly taught, sometimes expressed himself in conversation with extreme laxity on the subject. But he is not to be judged by reports of his conversational remarks, especially in those early days. Afterwards, as will be seen, he expounded his views on the subject in every variety of form—in articles—in sermons and reviews

* Letter to Mr Torry (July 7, 1792), in Torry Collection.

—and furnished the Church with abundant means of judging as to his soundness or unsoundness. The Church sometimes doubted the propriety of his language; but, as a whole, it never ceased, "through good report and evil report," to heap on him the surest marks of its confidence.

In September of this year (1792), Mr Gleig was again subjected to the indignity of having his unanimous election by the clergy of Dunkeld vetoed by the Episcopal College. The circumstances of this second case are not nearly so well known to us as those of the first. It would seem, in fact, as if care had been taken to keep all notice of it out of the Church's Records. There is no account of a second election of Mr Gleig at this time in the Diocesan Minute Book of Dunkeld; and the Church historians are silent regarding it.*

Of the fact, however, there can be no doubt. Mr Gleig repeats and reiterates it with all circumstantiality in letters written to Mr Torry and Dean Robertson, sixteen years after this time, when he was a third time elected to Dunkeld.

In his letter to Dean Robertson (Sept. 6, 1808) he says, "Having been twice unanimously elected to the diocese of Dunkeld before any clergyman now of that diocese was admitted, I believe, into holy orders, *and as often rejected with circumstances of insult*, to which you are probably a stranger, and I am myself desirous to forget, I formed a soleman resolution, on the promotion of Bishop Watson, never again to give any man an opportunity of treating me as I had *then* been treated, and as, I must be permitted to think, no part of my conduct as a clergyman had merited."

* Dr Neale, in his life of Bishop Torry, publishes the letters which establish the fact, but does not draw attention to it.

The word *then* seems to show that it was at the time of Bishop Watson's promotion that the second veto took place. But all doubt is removed by the following passage in his letter (Sept. 19, 1808) to Mr Torry. "To prevent unnecessary and dangerous delays, I have requested Messrs Robertson and Buchan, when they forward my letter declining the honour they intended me, to signify to the Primus that they transfer their votes from me to Mr Torry, to prevent the necessity of another meeting of the clergy. This, perhaps, is not a very formal or regular way of proceeding; *but something similar to it, though less regular, was sustained on the election of Bishop Watson to Dunkeld.*" Thus, at Bishop Watson's election, the votes of the clergy were transferred to that gentleman from some other candidate. That candidate was, of course, Mr Gleig.

The fact is further corroborated by the opening sentences of the letter to Dean Robertson. "I sincerely condole with you, on the loss you have sustained by the death of Bishop Watson. I knew him well after he became a Bishop; and his manners and principles were such as very quickly to root out from my mind some slight prejudices *excited by the singular mode in which he suffered himself to be elected by the See of Dunkeld.*"

There seems, then, no reason whatever to doubt that, in September 1792, Mr Gleig was regularly and unanimously elected Bishop for the second time by the clergy of Dunkeld, and that the Episcopal College decidedly, and "with circumstances of insult," refused to confirm the election; that then the clergy were worked upon by some influence to transfer their votes to Mr Jonathan Watson, a young man (of 31) lately come from the diocese of Aberdeen; that they, or a part of them,

consented to do so, and thus, without a second meeting of the clergy, Mr Watson was held to be duly and regularly elected, and was consecrated to the See. Finally, in order to preserve appearances, in extending the minutes, Mr Gleig's name was altogether omitted, and Mr Watson's only inserted!* Proof will be given later (chap. vi.) that this was not the only suppression of the kind, nor Dunkeld the only See to which Mr Gleig was elected more than once.

* Jonathan Watson (1761-1808), a native of Banffshire, held first the charge of the congregation, which at that time met at Blairdaff, now at Monymusk; then that of Banff; and lastly that of Laurencekirk; to which he removed in 1791, the year before he was raised to the See of Dunkeld. All accounts agree in representing him as a good, amiable, serious-minded man, with a turn for scholarly and theological disquisition. Some of his early letters (which now lie before the writer), are in every way very creditable productions.

CHAPTER IV.—1792-1804.

General State of Church Matters from 1792 *to* 1804—*Continues Contributions to "Encyclopædia"—Article on Theology—Analysis of Article—Becomes Editor of "Encyclopædia"—Receives Degree of LL.D., and is elected F.R.S.E.—Remuneration of his literary Labours—Has a Church built for his Congregation—Character of the Building, &c.—State of the Church in Edinburgh—Reviews Dr Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History—Publishes a Volume of Sermons—Contemporary Notices of Sermons—Laurencekirk Convocation.*

THE twelve years that passed between the Laurencekirk Convention of 1792, and the Laurencekirk Convocation of 1804 were, ecclesiastically, rather barren of interest and incident. The Church was very slow to realise the benefits of the Relief Act. No doubt the Clergy needed some time to make up their minds to take the oaths and sign the Articles; but less time might surely have sufficed. Another Convention* or two would probably have accelerated greatly the meeting of the Convocation. As for Mr Gleig, little, if any, help to a general Church movement could be looked for from him. No suggestions emanating from him would probably have been well received by the Heads of the Church. The Church at large he could serve only in a general way, and through the medium of the press. And through this medium he served well both the Church at large and the world at large. It was a great thing that the chief articles connected with religion in the

* The Conventions were mixed meetings, containing both Clergy and Laity. The Convocation was only a Clerical Meeting.

Encyclopædia, should be in such hands as his. His next great article, after that on Metaphysics, was on *Theology*. This article occupied nearly 70 pages of the *Encyclopædia* (vol. xviii.), and considering the time and circumstances under which it was written, it certainly is a production of great merit. No doubt it would have been a more complete, and better proportioned compendium, had it been intended to appear as a separate publication. The restraints, imposed by the nature of the work, prevented the writer from expressing himself, with perfect fulness and freedom, on some points, while, on other points, the desire to be strictly fair, and impartial, led to great copiousness of quotation. On the whole, however, the article gives a very correct and just view of "the prime articles" of the faith. It is divided into two sections, Natural and Revealed Theology, prefaced by an introduction, in which the writer traces out a somewhat ideal course of study for a student of theology, and recommends books. In recommending Leslie's short method with the Deists, he tells an instructive anecdote which he had from his friend Dr Berkeley, who had it from Archbishop Secker. "The celebrated Dr Middleton confessed [to Secker] that, for twenty years, he had laboured in vain to fabricate a specious answer" to Leslie's Work.

Part I., on Natural Theology, states very clearly and forcibly the arguments by which, eighty years ago, "The existence and attributes of God" were deduced from the works of God. It is needless to say that, for these times, that part of the article would have to be entirely re-cast. Since then, nature has yielded up to science many more of her deeper secrets, and we are getting nearer to the true "footprints of the Creator."

Part II., on Revealed Theology, is divided into five

sections, the first four of which treat of revelation before the coming of Christ. The only one of these four sections, that contains much controversial matter, is that on "The fall of Adam, and its consequences." This was a subject on which, as already stated, Dr Gleig himself held very strong and rather peculiar views. It may be said, in fact, to have been the favourite mysterious subject of the day, on which, as is usual on mysterious subjects, very extreme opinions were held and taught on both sides, one extreme provoking the other. The writer discusses the subject at considerable length, quoting the leading authorities on both sides, with their contradictory interpretations of the Scripture proofs, especially those from Psalms xiv. and li.

Some of the illustrations, made use of on both sides, seem more quaint than apt. The most striking, perhaps, is an illustration from *Delany's Revelation Examined with Caution*, of "the depravity of human nature" "upon the principles of natural knowledge." "We are told that the Indians are acquainted with a certain juice which immediately turns the person, who drinks it, into an idiot, leaving him, at the same time, in the enjoyment of his health, and all the powers of his body."

The important thing, however, biographically, is Dr Gleig's summing up of the controversy, and statement of his own opinion. "Thus have we given as full and comprehensive a view as our limits will permit of the different opinions of the Calvinists and Arminians, respecting the consequences of Adam's fall. If we have dwelt longer on the scheme of the latter than of the former, it is because every Arminian argument is built on criticism, and appeals to the original text; whilst the Calvinists rest their faith upon the plain words of Scripture, as read in our translation. If we might hazard our own opinion, we

should say that the truth lies between them, and that it has been found by the moderate men of both parties, who, while they make use of different language, seem to us to have the same sentiments. That all mankind really sinned in Adam, and are on that account liable to most grievous torments in soul and body, without intermission in hell fire for ever, is a doctrine which cannot be reconciled to our natural notions of God. On the other hand, if human nature was not somehow debased by the fall of our first parents, it is not easy to account for the numberless passages in Scripture which certainly seem to speak that language. . . . Nor do we readily perceive what should induce the more zealous Arminians to oppose so vehemently the general opinion of the corruption of human nature. Their desire to vindicate the justice and goodness of God does them honour; but the doctrine of inherent corruption militates not against these attributes; for what we have lost in the first Adam, has been amply supplied to us in the Second, &c."

In section 4—View of Theology from the Fall of Adam to the Coming of Christ—the writer controverts stoutly the conclusion, supported chiefly by Bishop Warburton, that, "in the whole Old Testament, there is not a single intimation of a future state."

Warburton maintained that it was sufficient to enable the Israelites to understand the "sublime song" in Isaiah xxvi. 19, "Thy dead men shall live; together with my dead body shall they arise, &c."; that they had "distinct *ideas* of a resurrection from the dead, without knowing that the natural body is indeed to rise again." "The very supposition," he says, "is one of his lordship's most irreconcilable paradoxes, and it is a paradox which his system did not require him to support."

Of the great fundamental articles of the Faith—the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, the Atonement—the writer gives a very clear and sound exposition, with answers to objections.

On Justification, and the doctrine of imputed sin and certain kindred controverted subjects, he, as usual, cites at full length, and in their own words, the views both of the Calvinists and the Arminians.

On certain other subjects as to which there exists great diversity of view—*e.g.*, the ordinary channels of grace to the soul; the sacraments and the ministry of the Church—he, as was natural, touched somewhat lightly, yet in such a way as to indicate pretty distinctly both his own and the general moderate Anglican views.

He specifies six operations, or offices, of the Holy Ghost. On the second of these—*Regeneration*—he says, "The ancient fathers of the Church, as well as some very eminent divines, generally speak of baptism as the instrument in God's hand of man's regeneration." Of another—"Union with Christ through the Sacraments"—he says, "A fourth operation of the Holy Ghost, as He is the sanctifier of Christians, is to join them to Christ, and make them members of that one body of which He is the head, 'For by one Spirit are we all baptised into one body, &c.'; and as, in the ordinary course of His dealing with Christians, the Spirit is first given in baptism, so it is continued to the faithful by the instrumentality of the Lord's Supper, &c." The sixth operation respects the Christian ministry.

"As the gifts of grace are generally annexed to means to the proper use of the Word and Sacraments, it is a sixth office of the same Spirit to sanctify such persons as are regularly set apart for the work of the ministry. The same Spirit which illuminated the Apostles, and endowed

them with power from above to perform personally their Apostolic functions, fitted them also for sending others as they were sent by their Divine Master, and for establishing such a constitution of the Church as was best adapted for preserving Christians in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace. They committed a standing power to a successive ministry, to be conveyed down to the end of the world, &c."

There can be no better proof of Mr Gleig's position in the staff of contributors to the *Encyclopœdia* than the fact that, on the death of the original editor, he was appointed to succeed him. The editorial chair was a position for which, by his critical acumen, by the great extent and variety of his knowledge, and his untiring literary industry, he was eminently fitted. And all accounts agree that he discharged its duties with marked efficiency. He accomplished the task "of bringing the work to a conclusion" "with consummate ability, no slight portion of the matter being supplied by his own pen. The two supplementary volumes he wrote almost entirely, without any assistance whatever."*

His position as the editor of a work of so much importance brought him many friends, and much distinction. "It brought him into familiar intercourse with the leading men of Scotland—Professor Robinson, Dr Kiley the great anatomist, Dr Gregory, &c."†

His own University of King's College, Aberdeen, conferred upon him the degree of LL.D. He was also elected a member of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, at the meetings of which body "he read several able papers on literary and scientific subjects."‡

* See *Encyclopædia Britannica.*
† Letter to Writer from the ex-Chaplain General, Nov. 12, 1876.
‡ Letter to Writer, Jan. 21, 1875.

Besides fame, distinction, "and troops of friends," the editorship brought him solid gain. "The exact amount of remuneration received by him," says his son, "for his contributions to the *Encyclopædia*, I have no means of stating. It was, however, considerable for those days. I think that for editing the two supplementary volumes he was paid £500. What he received for his own articles I never heard."

The remuneration of his other literary labours, before and about this time, was on a rather less liberal scale. "His connection with the *British Critic* brought him in somewhere about £5 or £6 a month. The *Anti-Jacobin*, to which he was an early contributor, paid still worse. £2 or £3 a sheet was the uttermost they ever gave." "Bear in mind," adds the writer, "that literary labour was not compensated at the beginning of the century as it is now."

Amid all this abounding literary work, Mr Gleig was far from neglecting his proper clerical duties. He appears to have set to work, as soon as the Repeal of the Penal Laws (1792) opened the way for him, to procure the erection of a regular church; for the building was begun, if not finished, within three years. "The first regular church was built in Stirling in 1795, on a piece of ground called Friar's Carse, given by Dr Walter Stirling, a physician in Stirling, on which the present church was afterwards built." There is still extant "a disposition of the site by Dr Walter Stirling to certain Trustees, of which Dr Gleig was one in 1798, after the chapel was completed." Dr Gleig's "register of baptisms and burials began in 1806."*

The following is the late Chaplain-General's account of the new church:—

"It was a plain structure, oblong in form, without a

* Letter from Rev. Clement Lee Coldwell, April 30, 1875.

chancel, but for the age, and under the circumstances in which it was built, by no means unsightly. It was capable of containing about 200 people, and the morning congregations were excellent. In the afternoon, only residents in the town attended; but these gradually increased in number, till before the Bishop ceased to be Incumbent, the service in the afternoon was almost as well attended as in the morning. . . . The original church occupied the same site as that which is now on the spot."*

The following additional particulars were communicated by the Chaplain-General to the clergyman at Stirling, and printed in the *Trinity Church (Stirling) Magazine* for Feb. 1872. The building had "a railed-in Communion Table at the east end between two tall arched windows. The reading desk faced the north entrance, and had a clerk's desk below, and the pulpit above it. There was a very cracked bell. After this church was built the congregation increased amazingly. Indeed, but for the setting up of a new congregation at Alloa about the year 1807, of which the late Bishop Russell, then a young man, took charge, it would have compelled the building of a new edifice, many years prior to the erection in which you now officiate."

In a letter to his friend Mr Torry, dated Stirling, May 2nd, 1800, Dr Gleig mentions, incidentally, some facts which throw light on the state of the Church in Edinburgh at that time. Mr John Allan—Bishop Abernethy Drummond's assistant—"a friend whom" Dr Gleig "valued highly," had lately died, and the Bishop, he wrote, would be fortunate if he could find a successor to him, equally disposed "to bear with his own peculiarities, &c." He

* Letter to Writer, Nov. 12, 1874.

adds, "we have much need of some respectable clergyman in the Metropolis; for I do not hesitate to say that, except the Bishop, we have not now *one* in that city whom it is not painful to hear preach or read prayers. The consequence is, that the other two congregations have dwindled away to nothing." Thus it appears that there were at that time only three native congregations in Edinburgh, and two of the three had "dwindled away to nothing." There were at the same time, it seems, three English congregations in Edinburgh.

In the same letter, Dr Gleig mentions the death of his "excellent old friend Dr Doig,* whose knowledge of ancient literature far surpassed, both in extent and accuracy, that of any other man whom I have ever known." "I am to write his life," he adds, "for the transactions of the Royal Society, of which he was a fellow," &c. Dr Gleig wrote a good many biographical sketches of his eminent friends, which were inserted in the leading periodicals of the day—one of Professor Robinson, one of Lord Kellie, &c.

By far the most important of his biographies was a Life of Principal Robertson, prefixed to an edition of that distinguished author's Works.

At this time the Episcopal Church was thrown into a fever of excitement by the posthumous publication of Lectures on Ecclesiastical History by the late Dr Campbell, of Aberdeen. In these lectures Episcopacy in general,

* David Doig, LL.D. (1719-1800), for forty years Rector of the Stirling Grammar School, wrote for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, articles on Mythology, Mysteries, and Philology. A dissertation of his on the "Ancient Hellenes" was published in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. His most famous literary effort, however, was his controversy with Lord Kames, as to the Original Condition of man.—"Letters on the Savage State, &c." Dr Doig corresponded with Mr Skinner, of Longside, both in Latin and in English, and in 1795 he paid him a visit.

and Scotch Episcopacy in particular, was treated with very scant respect. Church government was affirmed to be a mere circumstance or "circumstantial, nowhere either expressly declared or implicitly suggested in all the Book of God."

So far, Dr Campbell argued, as could be gathered from its records, the primitive Church appeared to have been Congregational or Independent—anyhow it was Presbyterian. Its ministers were all equal. Such Episcopacy as existed was Congregational Episcopacy. Of this early Episcopacy, diocesan Episcopacy was a corruption. Scotch Episcopacy after the Revolution, when the College system was adopted, and Bishops were consecrated "at large," was no Episcopacy at all. The consecrations were "farcical."

Dr Gleig reviewed the Lectures in six consecutive numbers of the *Anti-Jacobin* (February to July 1801). Prefixed to the Lectures was a Life of Dr Campbell by Dr Skene Keith, the clever and versatile minister of Keith-hall, who, as Dr Gleig said, "because his hero was a good and a great man," was "determined to make him one of those faultless monsters whom the world never saw."* On account of "this extravagant panegyric" Dr Gleig, before examining the lectures, pointed out many defects in Dr Campbell's Translation of the Gospels, for instance, his rendering of verse 1st, Matthew vi. "Take heed that ye perform not your *religious duties* before men."

The arguments of the Lecturer regarding the constitution of the primitive Church Dr Gleig discussed with his usual learning, and power of argument and illustration.

* The *Anti-Jacobin* admitted with reluctance two letters from Dr Skene Keith, in defence of himself and Dr Campbell. But after its manner it accompanied the text of the letters, with a running commentary of foot-notes, in the following pedagogic style. † What sir, &c. ‡ Really, sir, we know not what to answer to this. It is such an instance of effrontery, &c. * But nothing can be more clear, sir, &c.

On the general question of the Constitution of the Early Church there was not much originality, either in the views or in the arguments of the lecturer. He appears, indeed, to have followed pretty closely the lead of Lord King.

The argument by which he maintains that the consecrations of the Post Revolution Scotch Bishops were "farcical ceremonies," Dr Gleig terms "a pitiful mixture of sophistry and ridicule." "Originally," Dr Campbell argued, "the terms *ordination* and *appointment to a particular charge* were perfectly synonymous. If one in those truly primitive times found it necessary to retire from the work of a bishop, he never thought of retaining either the title or the emoluments. To be made a bishop, and in being so, to receive no charge whatever, to have *no work to execute*, could have been regarded no otherwise than as a contradiction in terms." It was like being made a Sovereign without subjects, a husband without a wife, a shepherd without sheep. To this reasoning Dr Gleig applied the *reductio ad absurdum*.

"In the year 1654, Charles II. had no subjects in Ireland, where his authority had never been recognised. Yet we find him in that very year exercising acts of royalty by creating Irish peers;" hence "the Earl of Inchiquin's patent of peerage is a farcical deed."

Again, when the Sovereign raises a colonel to the rank of a general, without giving him the command of an army, the promotion is a *farcical ceremony*.

"When a man is created Doctor of Physic, whether by an English or Scotch University," he may not "exercise his profession," either in London or Edinburgh, "till he be admitted to the Royal College of Physicians." "All diplomas, therefore, by the University of Aberdeen, creating men Doctors of Physic, are *farcical deeds*," &c.

"When an English Bishop is translated from one See to another, there is necessarily a period——when he is Bishop of neither. During that period, therefore, he is a mere *layman*," &c. Of course the conclusion was, that "in 1654, Charles II. had a *right* to the Kingdom of Ireland." A general has a *right* to command an army —&c.; and a Bishop, though not consecrated to any particular Diocese, has a *right* to exercise his office wherever opportunity is given. He has general authority, though not particular jurisdiction. "Those Bishops at large, who were consecrated by the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Bishop of Edinburgh, and the Bishop of Dunblane, received by their consecration, authority to ordain priests and deacons, and to consecrate Bishops in any country on earth where no orthodox Episcopal Church was already planted. No maxim was more universally received in the first three centuries, than that every Bishop had a pastoral relation to the whole Catholic Church."

The Constitution of the primitive Church is a subject that had been much discussed before the time of Drs Campbell and Gleig. It has been much discussed since, with very slender results. The subject has its difficulties, in the comparative obscurity of the Scriptural intimations, and the scantiness of the historical records; and controversialists usually aggravate the difficulties by coming to the solution of them with a clean-cut theory, with which all authorities are made to square.

Dr Campbell made much of the case of Cyprian, who, "from the beginning of his episcopate, resolved to do nothing without the advice of the Clergy and the consent of the Laity—*Sine consilio vestro et sine consensu plebis.*" The practice of Cyprian, Dr Gleig explained by comparing it to the action of an absolute Sovereign "consulting

his ministers and nobles" before taking an important step; or "a cautious commander," "first hearing the opinion of a council of war," before hazarding "a desperate battle."*

When he had brought the publication of the *Encyclopædia* to a close, Dr Gleig naturally turned his thoughts to a literary undertaking more strictly in his professional line. He thus announced his intention in a letter to Mr Torry of May 11th, 1802:—"Now that I have got rid of my Herculean task, I am meditating a volume of sermons, preached on various occasions since 1793. If they have no other attraction, the subjects will be at least uncommon and striking, and such as it is to be wished rather than hoped that I shall have no occasion to handle again."

The volume of sermons appeared next year, under the title, "Sermons preached occasionally in the Episcopal Chapel, Stirling, during the eventful period from 1793 to 1803: By George Gleig, LL.D., F.R.S., Edinburgh." The sermons were 21 in number, and were mostly on subjects of the day. "A few of them were preached on occasions of National Fasting and National Thanksgiving, during the late war and at its conclusion." Others discussed the vexed theological questions of the hour. Some

* It is needless to say that the practice is equally consistent with a thoroughly constitutional Episcopacy, such as was recommended by the Committee of the Pan-Anglican Synod of 1867. Had no other Episcopacy than that of this Cyprianic type ever prevailed in the Church, less would have been heard of Presbyterianism and Independency. "Council of war" Episcopacy is more honoured in theory than in practice. In all the Anglican Churches that possess freedom of action, with the exception of the Scottish Episcopal, (which, however, is too much a mere dependency of the English Church to be quite free), the Bishop's Synod is a Constitutional Court; and, generally, the personal element in Episcopal government has been greatly circumscribed; apparently, too, with the very best effect. The Bishop's power is lessened, but his influence is increased. The change would be equally beneficial in this country, being entirely in accordance with the habits of the people in civil affairs; but it need hardly be looked for, till inevitable disestablishment comes upon the Church of England.

of them had been published before, separately. And "all but one" were now "published as they were preached, without additions or alterations of any kind, except here and there a *verbal* correction."

If we are to judge from the reviews in the leading English Church periodicals, the sermons were very well received, at least by the critics.

The *Anti-Jacobin Review*, in its number for July 1803, devotes upwards of twenty pages to a review of them. The review is highly eulogistical, but not indiscriminatingly so.

The following passage may be accepted as a somewhat flattering, but substantially just, contemporary estimate, both of the merits of the sermons, and also of the literary standing of their author.

"To our former valuable stock of sermons Dr Gleig has added another volume, which, in many respects, will bear to be compared, without much danger of suffering by the comparison, with those of the ablest English divines. The name of the writer is already familiar to the literary world; and his volume is such as might have been expected from his eminent talents, learning, and taste. Those readers, it is true, will be disappointed who hope to find in it a studied display of that profound erudition which the author is so well known to possess; but they will find in it, what is more useful to themselves as well as more honourable to him, an ample fund of most valuable instruction on topics moral, religious, and political; adapted to the circumstances of common life, and most closely connected with their best interests, both temporal and eternal. In this respect, indeed, these sermons are entitled to praise of the highest kind. They are all in their tendency strictly practical, and discover in their

preacher an ardent desire of being instrumental in prevailing with his hearers to approve themselves as honest men, as loyal subjects, and as good Christians. The topics which he has selected for discussion are in themselves important; his illustrations of them are happily chosen and forcibly applied; his reasoning throughout is perspicuous and close; whilst his general manner is most serious and impressive.

"The style of Dr Gleig in these compositions is, with very few exceptions, distinguished by uncommon excellence. Though everywhere easy, flowing, and natural, it is gracefully elevated and philosophically correct, &c."

After noticing most of the sermons either singly or in sets, and quoting freely from some of them, the reviewer proceeds to specify a few of "those slighter blemishes from which no human work was ever free," those "paucæ maculæ" "quas aut incuria fudit," &c.

In one passage, in reprobating the not unfrequent frivolous and empty talk of "fashionable companies," Dr Gleig "approaches too nearly the vulgar phraseology of colloquial discourse." The reviewer could have wished "that this elegant divine and moralist had conveyed the censure in different terms." Dr Gleig also "sometimes employed *will* where an Englishman would employ *shall*," and the reviewer remarks on "the curious circumstance" that "the most learned and correct of the Scotch literati" should thus misuse "those two little auxiliary verbs."*

* If the misuse of these two little words was a curious circumstance seventy years ago, it is still more curious now, when there is so much more communication between England and Scotland, and when English books and periodicals circulate so freely in Scotland. *Will* and *would* used for *shall* and *should* still betray the nationality of the best "Scotch literati." *Presently* also used in the sense of *at present* or *now* is another unmistakeable mark; and the peculiarity of this Scotticism is that it is rarely if ever used in conversation. It seems to be thought superfine English, too good for common use. While, however, *will* is in Scotland often used instead of *shall*, *shall* is seldom if ever used instead of will. It seems to have been often so used 60 or 80 years ago—witness the letters of Bishops Macfarlane and Jolly.

There is a somewhat shorter and less eulogistic, but still very favourable, notice of the sermons in the *British Critic* (Dec. 1803). The reviewer hits the blot in the doctrinal sermons. "Dr Gleig argues with vigour against the Antinomian system, and those violent exaggerations of the doctrine of original corruption, which, by implication, seem to make God the author of sin; but in doing so, he appears occasionally to pass the line of truth, and to give at least opportunities for a rigid interpreter to accuse him of denying the doctrine itself; nor is it very easy to see how some of his positions can be reconciled with the ninth and some other Articles of our Church."

Thus thought and wrote the critics of the time, who were probably the best judges of the sermons, which were, indeed, emphatically sermons for the times, being to a great extent occupied not only with the theological controversies of the hour, but also with exciting political, moral, and social questions, which, during that stormy decade, had been stirred to their depths by the tornado of the French Revolution. A large proportion of the sermons, indeed, were preached on fast days or thanksgiving days connected with the French war; and probably the chief interest of the volume now lies in the insight which it gives into the way in which the French Revolution and the principles of its promoters were then alluded to in the pulpit. There was no measure in the language which was used on the subject. Atheism and democracy were linked together, as cause and effect. "Their democratical principles are the offspring of Atheism, and where they have prevailed they have led to Atheism again" (Sermon 8, p. 130). In this country, "those wild clamours *for political reformation* which pervade all the lower orders of society may be traced to the single source of envy engrafted on

ignorance" (Sermon 10, p. 176). Those clamourers "embraced every opportunity of proclaiming the *right* of the French nation to adopt whatever form of government the people might choose to erect, &c. (Sermon 12, p. 212).

For other reasons, however, these sermons are still very readable. You feel in every line that you are in the hands of an original and vigorous thinker.

The next year, 1804, was an important year to the Church and to Dr Gleig. The Laurencekirk Convocation, which was held in October, decreed the adoption of the XXXIX. Articles of the Church of England as the Standard of the Church—a measure which led to an almost immediate and general ingathering of the separate or "qualified"* congregations. This re-union tended to redress the balance between North and South, and give to the Southern Clergy their due weight and influence in the Church. The effect on the position of Dr Gleig was soon apparent.

Notwithstanding the great importance of the Laurencekirk Meeting, Dr Gleig, it appears, was not present at it; why, it is impossible to say. He had apparently stood entirely aloof from Church politics for the last dozen years; but this was an occasion on which the ruling influences and he might have been expected to be at one. His absence may have been unavoidable. Anyhow, he was absent; and such a man could not but be "conspicuous by his absence." Much, indeed, was made of his absence. The English periodicals were some-

* The "Qualified" Congregations were such as complied entirely with the requirements of the Government; the Clergyman taking the oaths of allegiance and abjuration, and signing the XXXIX Articles, &c. The oaths formed the great crux. The Jacobites would not take the oaths; and hence they were called Non-jurors; and were so far outlawed.

what severely critical on the addresses made at the meeting, and as, with the exception of Bishop Jolly, Bishop Skinner and his son were the only speakers whose remarks were reported, it seemed to be assumed that the reviews had been written or inspired by some opponent of the Skinner family, and, if so, by whom but by Dr Gleig? Bishop Macfarlane, writing to his friend Mr Torry (May 15, 1805), says—"I confess I was hurt on reading the review of our Laurencekirk sermon; it is a reflection indirectly on us all. Had the . . . Dr (G. G.) been with us, it is probable no fault would be found. He hath an old grudge, &c."

Considering his literary activity and influence, and the "old grudge," it was natural to blame Dr Gleig in this matter; but he had had nothing to do with the reviews in question.

From annoyance at having every review and notice of the sort fathered upon him, he had some time previously withdrawn from the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, and even ceased to take it in; and he did not so much as know who the reviewer in the *British Critic* was. All this and more he explains in a letter to Mr Torry (May 18, 1805.)

Mr John Skinner, Forfar, had published a pamphlet in vindication of himself and his father, the Primus, from the strictures of the reviewers both of the Laurencekirk addresses and also of "Primitive Truth and Order." Dr Gleig says, "I have read Mr Skinner's publication with some attention; but really like not to give an opinion of any part of it. . . Of the sermon, I shall say nothing, but that I do not understand it. With the replies to the *Anti-Jacobin Review* and *British Critic*, I am much better pleased than I expected to be. I had reason to believe that the author affected to consider me as the reviewer of

his father's book,* and that his reply would be a tissue of petulance and personality. In that case I must have taken some notice of it; because the unlucky discovery, made first by the Primus, and afterwards by Bishop A[bernethy] D[rummond], to Skene Keith, of the name of the reviewer of Dr Campbell's† lectures, was attended with consequences to me which I hope these prelates did not wish to ensue, and which I am certain one of them never dreamed of. I was supposed to be the author of everything that was called severe in that journal, especially if it related to the Constitution of the Church; and I suspect that even the review of Dr Hill's Synonyms was given to me, though I had retired, I may say, from the *Anti-Jacobin* before that work was published. This procured to me so much coldness from different persons, whose friendship I had long enjoyed and highly valued, and was attended

* "Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated"—a reply to Dr Campbell's attacks on Episcopacy in his Lectures. The reviews, both of this work, and of the Laurencekirk sermon in the *British Critic* and the *Anti-Jacobin*, appear sufficiently friendly and appreciative. Little is found fault with beyond the Bishop's style, which was his weak point. "The style is confused, not always intelligible, often inaccurate, and occasionally even ungrammatical"—*British Critic*, vol. xxv., p. 265, on Primitive Truth and Order. "The learned Prelate's style still continues to be, in numerous instances, disfigured by the same inaccuracy and slovenliness of manner, of which, on a former occasion, we complained"—*Anti-Jacobin*, vol. xx., p. 176—Review of Laurencekirk Sermon. Much the same is said of the Bishop's style by his son—"Annals of Scotch Episcopacy, p. 34"—"diffuse and tautological, though always impressive." The references to Mr John Skinner in the reviews of the Laurencekirk publication seem decidedly unfair. Too much is made of his "putting himself forward." It is not pretended that by coming forward he kept any other Presbyter back; and it was certainly desirable that the Presbyters should find some mouthpiece in their number.

† George Campbell, D.D. (1719-1796), made Principal of Marischal College, Aberdeen, in 1759, was a man of great ability, and was distinguished in other walks of literature besides the ecclesiastical. Whateley characterises his "Philosophy of Rhetoric" as the most important work that had been produced, on the subject, in modern times, for "depth of thought and ingenious original research, &c." Had he lived to see his "Lectures" through the press, the language would doubtless have been more guarded. Reference is made (Bishop Jolly, p. 169) to his peculiar pronunciation of *authority*. On account of other peculiarities of a like sort, connected with the ancient classical sound of the c, he is said to have been known among the students as "The Prinkipal."

with other disagreeable circumstances of more importance, that I found myself under the necessity of withdrawing my regular contributions from the *Anti-Jacobin*, and circulating among my friends an assurance that I had done so. Had Mr Skinner introduced my name into his vindication of himself and his father, or even made to me a pointed allusion, I should certainly have contradicted him in that journal; stated how very little connection I had had with it for years; given a full detail of the circumstances which induced me to withdraw any little aid I could give to a miscellany so meritorious; and called upon the Editor to confirm my statement." He was, therefore, "happier than" Mr Torry "could conceive" that he had been spared the necessity of doing this.

Dr Gleig took a wise step in withdrawing from the *Anti-Jacobin*. No doubt he had hitherto given too much time to periodical writing, which can seldom, especially when it is of a controversial nature, be entirely satisfactory to the writer. He often writes in haste, and regrets at leisure. Dr Gleig apologised on one or two occasions, when he had written in heat and haste, and made "the ridicule too pointed."

CHAPTER V.—1804-8.

Is proposed for the Diocese of Edinburgh by Dr Sandford, when the latter was elected—Versatility—Contributes to "British Critic"—Is charged with Pelagianism, on account of Reviews in "British Critic"—Elected once more to Bishopric of Dunkeld—Letters—Minority dissent—Grounds of Dissent—Declines Dunkeld—Is unanimously elected Coadjutor Bishop of Brechin—Is required to "emit a declaration" regarding Scotch Office—Consecration—Circular letters to the Brechin Clergy—Uniformity—Scheme for promoting Theological discussion among the Clergy.

In less than a month from the Laurencekirk Convocation (Oct. 24—Nov. 19, 1804), the Rev. Dr Sandford, of Edinburgh, and his congregation came over to the native Church, and within two months (Jan. 15, 1805) Dr Sandford was elected Bishop of Edinburgh.

At the meeting at which he was elected, Dr Sandford did Dr Gleig the honour to propose *him* for the Bishopric,* and if the question had been a general one as to the fittest man among the Edinburgh Presbyters for the Episcopal office, there could have been no doubt as to Dr Gleig's superior claims. But the question was, which Presbyter's appointment was most likely to promote re-union. And there could be no doubt that it was Dr Sandford's. The acceptance of a Scotch Bishopric by an English Presbyter could not but produce a great effect on the outstanding

* "My own amiable and excellent diocesan . . . proposed me for the diocese of Edinburgh, when he was himself elected to it." Letter to Dean Robertson, Sept. 6, 1808.

English Clergy and congregations throughout the country. Churchmen generally had for some time laboured to bring about such an appointment, and in fact Dr Sandford's election had been altogether a pre-arranged affair, Dr Abernethy Drummond having at the Convocation resigned the See of Edinburgh to make way for him. The appointment appears to have given great and lasting satisfaction to Dr Gleig.

Writing to Mr Torry (May 24, 1806), he says, "I have had no occasion to write you since the consecration of Bishop Sandford, an event which promises to be productive of very beneficial effects, though it has excited some ridiculous alarm in the Kirk. The Bishop, however, proceeds on his even tenor with that seriousness and mildness for which he is remarkable, &c." And shortly, before ceasing to be under his Episcopal sway, he (as just quoted), speaks of him as "my own amiable and excellent diocesan."

The P.S. of the above quoted letter gives a good idea of the versatility of Dr Gleig, also of the pursuits of the Stirling literati, and of the exorbitantly expensive way in which books were occasionally got up in those days. "I am reading with attention, and for a certain purpose [doubtless for a review] Mr Stewart's* Sallust, which is in every sense of the word an elegant book; but for men of small fortunes, £4 „ 12s. is a high price. I think our friend judged wrong in loading it with so many notes, and likewise in publishing it in so splendid a form, and in this instance he has certainly given the lie to a favourite maxim of his own, that "in elegance there is no expense."

It appears from an incidental notice by Bishop Walker that Dr Gleig still continued his contributions to the

* Mr (afterwards Sir Henry) Stewart of Allanton.

British Critic. "I passed the winter from November 1806 to May 1807 in Fraserburgh . . . . On my way to Fraserburgh, I passed a week with Dr Gleig at Stirling, who was then employed in some controversial writing in the *British Critic*, which brought on him the accusation of Pelagianism, by persons who evidently did not know what Pelagianism really is. He was anxious to furnish an accurate account of that heresy; but his principal authority was Collier's Church History, and he had not the means of tracing the original authorities to which Collier refers."

The article on which Dr Gleig was then engaged did not appear till January 1808 (see *British Critic*, Vol. 31). It was a review of an anonymous work on "Primitive Truth, &c., in which the question concerning the Calvinism of the Church of England is determined by positive evidence." Why Dr Gleig was so anxious to verify Collier's quotations is apparent from the review. He prints in a foot-note a summary of Pelagianism, "which," he says "on a former occasion was sent by a Calvinist to the present writer, as containing, he supposed, the substance of his creed! It is taken from Collier's Ecclesiastical History, and *as we were at some pains to compare it with the authorities to which Collier refers*, we can with confidence pronounce it to be a very accurate summary of the opinions of Pelagius, though we surely need not add that it is very different from the creed of any writer in the *British Critic*, as well as of any English Arminian, of whose works we have ever written in terms of approbation." (*B.C.* 31, p. 49).

"The controversial writing in the *British Critic* which had brought" on Dr Gleig "the accusation of Pelagianism" was—as clearly appears from this article—a review

of Overton's True Churchman (*British Critic*, vol. 21); and a review of Laurence's Bampton Lectures. (*B.C.*, vol. 24).

These reviews are both very decidedly Anti-Calvinistic, and we need not probably go beyond this fact for the origin of the charge of Pelagianism. Calling Dr Gleig a Pelagian might be simply a zealous Calvinist's "way of saying that he differed from him in opinion." It is clear from these articles in the *British Critic*, as well as from all else that he wrote on the subject, that any apparent Pelagianism of language into which Dr Gleig fell was *his* way of expressing difference of opinion from the extreme Calvinists of the day, especially on the subject of the *guilt* of original sin. Their exaggeration of the guilt provoked his minimising of it.

The time was now drawing near when Dr Gleig was at last to find the natural and fitting sphere for his great talents. In the summer of 1808 Bishop Watson of Dunkeld died; and for the third time the clergy of that diocese chose Dr Gleig for their Bishop. Sixteen years had elapsed since the last election, and during that time the personnel of the Dunkeld clergy had undergone a complete change. Yet the diocese continued true to its old choice; and but for the opposition of Mr John Skinner, who had lately entered the diocese, Dr Gleig would, almost to a certainty, have been unanimously elected once more.

Fortunately, we have in this instance ample documentary proof of all the steps in the election; and the reader will probably agree that everything said and done on the occasion by Dr Gleig redounds highly to his credit.

The first intimation which Dr Gleig appears to have had of his proposed election was "a letter from Mr Robertson, the senior clergyman of the diocese of Dun-

keld, requesting to know if I would accept the office of their Bishop if I should be elected, as he had reason to think I would be by a decided majority—indeed, he said, by all but Mr Skinner."

To Mr Robertson's letter Dr Gleig sent the following reply, regarding which, and the other letters on the same subject, the reader will probably agree with Dr Neale in thinking that "it is impossible to avoid admiring the straightforward manliness of Dr Gleig's conduct and expressions."*

"Stirling, Sept. 6, 1808.—Rev. and Dear Sir,—I sincerely condole with you and your diocesan brethren for [sic] the loss you have sustained by the death of Bishop Watson. I knew him well after he became a Bishop; and his manners and principles were such as very quickly to root out from my mind some slight prejudices excited by the singular mode in which he suffered himself to be elected to† the See of Dunkeld, and even to command my sincere love and esteem.

"To be thought worthy to succeed such a Bishop, by the clergy over whom it was his fortune to preside, is on several accounts very grateful to me; for the man must possess either a larger share of pride, or a smaller regard for honest fame than I trust shall ever be laid to my charge, who would not be gratified by the steady attachment of a whole diocese for upwards of twenty years 'through good report and evil report.' Yet I hope you will not deem me ungrateful though I beg leave to decline the honour which you intend me, and recommend to you and your diocesan brethren some clergyman who is more acceptable to the leading members of the Episcopal College than there is reason to believe me to be.

* Neale's Torry, p. 63.

† In Neale's Torry this is, by mistake, printed "*by* the See of Dunkeld." *By* and *to* were by no means equivalent in this case.

"Having been twice unanimously elected to the diocese of Dunkeld, before any clergyman now of that diocese was admitted, I believe, into holy orders, and as often rejected with circumstances of insult, to which you are probably a stranger, and which I am myself desirous to forget, I formed a solemn resolution, on the promotion of Bishop Watson, never again to give any man an opportunity of treating me as I had then been treated, and as I must be permitted to think, no part of my conduct as a clergyman had merited.

"Were I, therefore, unanimously elected to-morrow, I could not accept, unless the majority of the Episcopal College should declare it to be their opinion that it is *my duty to accept*; and I have not the smallest reason to believe that the majority of the present College are disposed to make such a declaration. My own amiable and excellent diocesan probably *is*, for he proposed me for the diocese of Edinburgh when he himself was elected to it, and since that period has often expressed an earnest wish that I were one of his colleagues rather than one of his presbyters; but I am not aware that we have another Bishop who concurs with him in such a wish. On the other hand, I have reason to know that Mr Torry of Peterhead would be most acceptable to the Primus and Bishop Jolly; and that Bishop Sandford will cheerfully concur with them in promoting him to the Episcopate.

"From this statement, on the accuracy of which you may rely, you must perceive the impropriety of electing me your Bishop, since there is not the smallest probability of the condition being complied with, on which *alone I can* accept of an election to the Episcopate. If, on the other hand, you elect Mr Torry, whom I know to be as well qualified to fill the high station as any presbyter in the

Church, I have reason to believe that his promotion will meet with no opposition whatever; whilst the present weakness of the Episcopal College, and consequent danger of the succession, proclaims aloud that this is not a time for altercation or delay. . . . I must request you and your brethren to accept my thanks for the honour that you have done me, and to give your votes to Mr Torry, or any other deserving clergyman. With great regard, I am, rev. Sir, your affectionate brother, &c., Geo. Gleig."

Eight days from the date of the above letter—Sept. 14—the election was held at Alyth. The following is an extract from the Minute of Election.

"After prayers," the constituting of the meeting, and the reading of the mandate, "the Dean proposed the Rev. George Gleig, LL.D., Presbyter in Stirling, as a proper person to fill the vacancy in the College occasioned by the death of Bishop Watson. Immediately after, Mr Skinner proposed the Rev. Patrick Torry, Presbyter of Peterhead. After some deliberation, it was put to the vote which of the two should be elected, when there appeared for Dr Gleig, the Rev. James Somerville, chaplain to Sir George Stewart; John Buchan of Kirriemuir, and the Dean; for Mr Torry, the Rev. John Skinner of Forfar, and David Moir. In consequence thereof, the majority is in favour of the Rev. Dr Gleig, who is declared to be duly elected, and now to be recommended accordingly to the College of Bishops, with all convenient speed. In testimony whereof we subscribe the Deed of Election, day and date aforesaid.—(Signed) John Robertson, John Buchan, James Somerville."

Then the minority entered their reasons of dissent.

"Dissentient for the following reasons:

"Primo. We consider Mr Somerville as no Presbyter

of this diocese. His residence is in Edinburgh, and he is unpossessed of letters of collation to any charge in the Church. His being employed, moreover, by Bishop Sandford is tantamount to his being a recognised member of that Bishop's diocese, more especially as his letters of Presbyteration bear Bishop Sandford's signature.

"Secundo. That, having stated to our reverend brethren the sense of the Episcopal College at large on the subject of Mr Torry's election, and having informed them of the engagements which were about to take place for his removal (in the event of his becoming Bishop of Dunkeld) to the vicinity of his diocese, we conceive it to be an unbecoming measure on the part of the Presbyters of Dunkeld to intrude, at the present time, any other person as a candidate for admission into that venerable body, be his merits what they will, and we acknowledge Dr Gleig's merits to be not a few.—(Signèd) John Skinner, David Moir."

Some of these reasons of dissent are very characteristic of the period. Under two heads, at least three reasons are given; but only the first one, the objection to Mr Somerville's vote, is at all relevant. It may be a question—not easily determinable now—whether, according to the rule and practice of the time,* Mr Somerville's vote

* According to Canon IV. of the Code of 1743, then in force, the right to elect the Bishop belonged to "the Presbyters of the district" or diocese, without any requirement as to their holding a charge or incumbency. Mr Somerville doubtless officiated in Edinburgh in winter, and in Dunkeld diocese in summer; thus being a Presbyter of two dioceses, and having two Bishops. This was the case with the late Rev. James Smith of Forgue, in the diocese of Aberdeen, who held, in addition to Forgue, the charge of Aberchirder, in the diocese of Moray; and who took in every respect the position of an incumbent in the diocese of Moray, as well as in that of Aberdeen; thus having two Bishops, and voting in two Synods. He was Dean of Moray for a good many years. The present Canons, of course, define much more precisely the qualifications of voters; and a Presbyter, in the position of Mr Somerville, would probably be held to be disqualified, by not having "officiated continuously in the diocese . . . for not less than two years immediately preceding" (Canon III. 5); though it might be disputed whether removal to town with his patron in winter was a breach of continuity in the sense of the Canon.

was altogether regular and valid. But the question is not of material consequence; for, even had Mr Somerville's vote been altogether null, it could not have invalidated Mr Gleig's election, as without it the deliberative votes were equal, and Mr Gleig had, in addition, the Chairman's casting vote, which gave him the majority.

No one in these days would dare to bring forward either of the other two reasons. The proposal to remove Mr Torry to the vicinity of the diocese, through, as it appears, an exchange of charges, was one, on which, from the improbability of realisation, no stress whatever could be laid. Too many consents were necessary. It was, in fact, a mere proposal of Mr Skinner's own, and nothing more seems to have been heard of it.* Even had it been successful, however, it would hardly have put Mr Torry in a better position with regard to "vicinity" to the diocese than that in which Dr Gleig already stood. Dr Gleig had lived for twenty years, and continued to live for thirty more, in the very immediate vicinity of the united diocese of Dunkeld and Dunblane. He had only to step out of his house and cross the bridge of Stirling to be *in* it.

Mr Torry, on the other hand, lived, and by all the rules of probability, would continue† to live the breadth of

* See Neale's Torry, p. 54. The letter there printed is one written by Mr Torry in answer to one suggesting his removal to Forfar, with the view of becoming Bishop of Dunkeld, on the demise of Bishop Watson, "then in declining health." This letter, Dean Torry says (Letter to Writer, May 15th, 1875), was addressed to Mr John Skinner, as indeed is pretty clear from internal evidence. The proposal was, it appears, one for an exchange of livings by Mr Torry and Mr Skinner; and Dean Torry says it fell through in consequence of his father's disinclination to leave Peterhead. Most likely it was this proposal that gave rise to "the unjust suspicions regarding him and his family," to which the Primus refers. See postea, p. 257.

† Bishop Torry never left Peterhead. He had, during his whole Episcopate, to cross the diocese of Aberdeen and that of Brechin to reach his own diocese. Bishop Gleig again had to cross the diocese of Dunkeld in order to reach his diocese. Thus, for thirty years, the two Bishops, in all their visitations, continued to cross and recross each other's dioceses.

two dioceses from Dunkeld diocese. In these circumstances it certainly must have required some boldness on the part of the objectors to speak of 'intruding' Dr Gleig into the diocese of Dunkeld. But, doubtless, all parties felt that the real strength of the objections lay in what the objectors called "the sense of the Episcopal College." The Bishops favoured Mr Torry. A declaration to this effect by Mr Skinner—the Primus's son—was probably regarded as decisive of the contest.* Hardly any candidate in those days, least of all Dr Gleig, would have held out against the College Candidate, if that candidate was backed by any show of diocesan support. The following letters to Mr Torry show how Dr Gleig acted in face of such opposition :—

"Stirling, Sept. 17, 1808.—My dear Sir,—Some time ago I received from Mr Robertson, the senior clergyman of the Diocese of Dunkeld, a letter requesting to know if I would accept the office of their Bishop, if I should be elected, as he had reason to think I would be, by a decided majority, indeed, he said, by all but Mr Skinner. I had formerly recommended you warmly to Bishop Sandford for that office, of which I am myself anything but ambitious; and I wrote to Mr Robertson a letter, of which I send a copy, with this. I was therefore surprised this morning by a letter from Mr Skinner, informing me that I was elected by a majority of three to two; that he was in the minority; and that he had recorded his reasons of dissent, some of which are sufficiently strong. I have not

* Mr Torry, in his answer to the letter suggesting his removal to Forfar, &c., shows that he felt that the favour of the College was all-important, and wanted to be assured of it beforehand. "But supposing," he says, "that I should be acceptable to the clergy, is it clear that I should also be acceptable to the Bishops? Your friendly partiality makes you say so, but I suppose you say it only as a matter of opinion, and *not from any positive declaration to that effect.*"

got the deed of election, and of course have it not in my power yet to give in either a formal acceptance or a formal refusal of the honour intended me; but I shall, most certainly, decline that honour, provided you will accept of it. I would decline it at any rate, having no desire for squabbles about promotion, were there not danger, if it should be declined by both you and me, of its falling into very improper hands. I *know*, that if I decline, you will be *unanimously* elected; but if you and I both decline, God knows on whom the election may fall. Let me then hear from you by the return of post, that I may be prepared to write a decided answer to Mr Robertson as soon as I receive from him the deed of election; and that they may proceed to another election on the same mandate without loss of time. Be assured, my dear sir, that it will give me unfeigned pleasure to see you Bishop of Dunkeld, and let not something like a preference given by the clergy to me prejudice you against accepting of an office of which Mr Skinner assures me they *all* acknowledge you worthy, at the very instant that three of them voted for me. This is not a time for standing on punctilio or delicacy of feeling; and the Clergy of Dunkeld are the more excusable for betraying a partiality for me, from their knowledge of the manner in which I was formerly treated when elected to that See, and when I could have been of infinitely greater use to the Church there than I could now be as a Bishop."

This letter was followed up two days later (Sept. 19) by another, which was still more decided. Dr Gleig had received the deed of election and the protest, and he now conjured Mr Torry to accept; *he* could not. The letter was as follows.

"My dear Sir,—I received this morning the deed of

election from Dunkeld, together with Messrs Skinner and Moir's protest against it. Of the protest it is needless to speak; but it is proper to say that of *such an election, so protested against*, I cannot accept. Let me, therefore, conjure you by our old friendship to accept of the office, which I have declined; for, by doing so, I verily believe you will render a greater service to the Church than most individuals have had it in their power to do. You will certainly do a thing acceptable to all the Bishops, most acceptable to me, and, I have reason to believe, tending to the harmony of the diocese of Brechin at their ensuing election. Trusting that you will do so, and to prevent unnecessary and dangerous delays, I have requested Messrs Robertson and Buchan, when they forward my letter declining the honour which they intended me, to signify to the Primus that they transfer their votes from me to Mr Torry to prevent the necessity of another meeting of the clergy. This, perhaps, is not a very formal or regular way of proceeding; but *something similar to it, though certainly less regular, was sustained in the election of Bishop Watson to Dunkeld*;* and as all the clergy at their late meeting declared you worthy of the office, no man but myself has a right to object to the informality of the proceedings.† . . .—I am, &c., G. G."

The result was that Mr Torry, thus pressed, agreed to accept Dunkeld, and was elected without further opposition. No doubt, as Dr Gleig said, all the clergy of the diocese acknowledged that he was "worthy of the office"; still he was in a manner forced upon the majority, and a feeling of soreness remained, blended with bitterness

* The reader will please note this statement, which has been already quoted. Antea, p. 222.

† This letter is printed at length in Neale's Torry, but with some omissions of words and clauses, which are supplied in the portion which is given above.

towards Mr John Skinner, which apparently extended to his father the Primus also.

The latter, writing to Bishop Torry (Nov. 17, 1808) says, "My son at Forfar writes me that he had been favoured with a letter from you, wherein you wish to know from him the state of things at Perth, of which it seems he can give you no information. His words are, 'Were I in Siberia, I could not know less of Church matters in this diocese than I do.' To tell you this, he thinks it needless to put you to the expense of a postage, and therefore begs of me to mention it the first time I write. Perhaps the Dean and his co-adjutor at Kirriemuir have not yet got over the opposition which was made to their first election, the more alarming, it seems, as coming from one of my family, of which it would appear that suspicions have been lately circulated, as unjust with respect to me or mine as unexpected from the quarter where they are said to have arisen."* What the unjust suspicions were does not appear; but, doubtless, they were connected somehow both with the persistent opposition of the Skinner family to the promotion of Dr Gleig, and also with the proposed exchange of livings by Mr John Skinner and Mr Torry. However unjust the suspicions might be, they were by no means unnatural. The only real ground for them, however, was doubtless of a public rather than of a private nature, springing chiefly, if not entirely, from an excess of zeal for the Northern tradition —a strong desire to retain the chief Church power in the North, and gradually, by administrative action, to mould the South to the pattern of the North. Certainly a belief now pervaded the Church that this was the settled policy of the Primus and his friends; and as such a policy was

* Letter in Torry Collection.

hardly consistent with the understanding on which the qualified congregations had been recently admitted, the mere suspicion of it was sufficient to rouse opposition. Anyhow, opposition was not wanting; and from this time the old Northern ascendancy declines. Elsewhere than in the diocese of Dunkeld there was a feeling that Dr Gleig had been unjustly treated. He soon had practical proof that his late opponents had little sympathy from their neighbours. While the diocese of Dunkeld was as a Siberia to Mr John Skinner, the neighbouring diocese of Brechin was with one voice calling on Dr Gleig to become its Bishop. Bishop Strahan was now *ab agendo*, and the clergy of the diocese met at Montrose, Sept. 28, 1808, and unanimously chose Dr Gleig as "successor to" him.*

Such a well-timed tribute to his merits could not fail to be most highly gratifying to Dr Gleig. Doubtless, by him and by others, Brechin was taken as an exponent of the feelings of the whole Church—and the election regarded as a testimonial and protest.

One is apt to suppose that, as the two elections came so closely together, Dr Gleig must have had some inkling of the probable result of Brechin before he finally declined Dunkeld. But he himself distinctly negatives this supposition; affirming, in a letter to Bishop Torry, that at the time that he declined Dunkeld, it was believed that Mr Walker, of Edinburgh, would be the elect of Brechin. In the same letter, as in others, he repeats his *nolo Episcopari* with every appearance of sincerity.

This time he certainly had it in his power to accept or reject. But even now the choice was not so free as it

* In their address to Dr Gleig, the clergy say, "We . . . earnestly entreat of you to accept the office, to which, by our unanimous suffrages, you have been elected." The address is signed by seven Presbyters.

ought to have been. The Primus does not appear to have ever entertained the idea of vetoing this election. Even if he had had the wish, it is doubtful if he would have had the power; for the Church and College too had greatly changed within the last sixteen years; but though he did not interpose a direct veto, he imposed a test, binding the Bishop elect to the maintenance of the Scotch office—a test against which had Dr Gleig stood out, as he had every right to do, the result might have been a veto. The origin of the test is very characteristic of the times. Though of vital importance to the whole Church, North and South, especially South, there was no attempt made to consult the Church—least of all the South. The matter was apparently settled in an off-hand manner at a sort of chance meeting of the three Northern Bishops.* This is the account which the Primus himself gives of the matter in his letter to Dr Gleig—"With a view to the faithful discharge of this sacred trust (the preservation of what is pure and primitive in the Church), I have had some conference with my two colleagues, the Bishops of Ross and Moray, who have been with me for two days past, on an occasion, which rather brought us unexpectedly together. The former (Bishop Macfarlane) having come this length, with a son returning to Oxford for his education, it chanced that the deed of election from the Clergy of Dunkeld arrived at the same time. I thought it a pity to put Bishop Macfarlane to the trouble of returning to this place, for the consecration of the person elected, and there-

* That the three Bishops took counsel with the Bishop-elect, whose declaration was to be "a precedent for our future proceedings," does not add to the regularity of the proceeding. No such test, propounded suddenly to a Bishop-elect by his Consecrators, on the very eve of his Consecration, could be expected, in those days, at least, to receive an entirely calm and unbiassed consideration. It could hardly fail to be regarded chiefly from the personal point of view.

fore wrote immediately to Bishop Jolly, who very readily came up hither on Monday, and brought Mr Torry along with him, whose consecration took place in my chapel yesterday, with all due solemnity.

Having this favourable opportunity of communicating our sentiments to each other, and after fully discussing the subject of our deliberations, Mr Torry, animated by the same spirit, which pervaded all our proceedings, gave in to us the following declaration, written and subscribed by himself, viz., &c."

After transcribing the declaration, the Primus adds, "Having now such a plain rule before us, and so satisfactory a precedent for our future proceedings, *I am determined, with God's help, to abide by it* in any future promotion, at least of a Scottish ordained Presbyter that may take place in our Church. If you then can sincerely and conscientiously emit a declaration similar to that above quoted ——, you may rest assured, &c."

Thus the Primus at once makes it perfectly clear to Dr Gleig that he is "determined" not to consecrate him, unless he shall "emit" such a declaration as the above. The "plain rule" on which he went, was little more than the *sic volo sic jubeo*. There can be no doubt that the "rule" was adopted in this hasty irregular way as a test and safeguard against Bishops elect of too pronounced Anglican sympathies. Mr Torry's signature was doubtless obtained as a "satisfactory precedent." It had not been thought necessary to lay down any conditions to him, all the arrangements for his consecration having been completed before the matter was discussed.

It is pretty plain from Dr Gleig's letters on the occasion, both to Bishop Torry and the Primus himself, that he was quite conscious not only of the irregularity of this measure,

but also of its impolicy. He affirms distinctly that he is as much attached to the Scotch office as the Primus himself, but intimates not less distinctly that he would probably "take *different ways* of recommending it."

But as the required declaration "bound him to nothing but what he had uniformly practised since he was a clergyman, and what," he added, "he would be strongly inclined to practise were his excellent diocesan to forbid him to do so," to sign the declaration was for Dr Gleig himself a very simple affair. And in the circumstances, he might be well excused if he gave himself little trouble about the irregularity of the proceeding on the part of the Bishops. He could not prevent them from taking their course for the maintenance of the Scotch office. He could only reserve to himself the liberty to take his own course. This he did. "I am, therefore," he wrote to the Primus, "perfectly ready to subscribe and deliver to you a declaration similar to that which has been delivered to you by Bishop Torry, and to do so whether I am promoted to the Episcopal Bench or not; but I trust," he added, "that I shall be left at liberty to recommend the office by those means in my power which appear to my own judgment best adapted to the end intended. Controversy does not appear to me well adapted to this end, unless it be managed with great delicacy indeed. . . Public controversy I will never directly employ, nor will I encourage it in others."*

* Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, pp. 476-7-8. For the text of the declaration, see Annals, p. 475. The gist of it is—"The use of which (the Scotch office) I will strenuously recommend by my own practice, and by every other means in my power." Bishop John Skinner did not live to confirm or consecrate another Bishop-elect; and the present Bishop of Glasgow, (who has kindly made investigations for the writer), is of opinion that this declaration was never again exacted from a Bishop-elect. It was "a temporary expedient," and was "never recorded in the Episcopal Register." The writer had been under the impression that it continued to be exacted till it was objected to as uncanonical by a Bishop-elect, and that then it was quietly dropt.

It is clear from this letter, and, if possible, still clearer from another letter written some time after his consecration, that in Dr Gleig the old Northern Churchman remained unchanged in principle, though somewhat modified in manner. He had maintained, and would maintain, the Scotch office—he was the only clergyman in the diocese of Edinburgh that made use of it—but it was only by private moral suasion that he would maintain it. Times were changed with the introduction of the English congregations.

Dr Gleig's letter was, it is said, "deemed satisfactory." It is hard to see how any other conclusion could have been come to. But it is probable that, as yet, the Northern Bishops but faintly realised the great change which their closer connection with the English Church had wrought in their position. When once the Church had "two nations struggling in her womb," one great and powerful, the other small and weak, the result should not have been long doubtful to any observer.

Now, however, all hesitation ceased, and the just and the right thing was done at last. The Brechin election was confirmed, and Dr Gleig was consecrated. His consecration took place on Sunday, October 30, in St Andrew's Church, Aberdeen, the officiating Bishops being the Primus, and Bishops Jolly and Torry. He himself had requested that the place might be Stonehaven, and the day the Festival of St Simon and St Jude (Oct. 28); but this request had not been complied with, probably because the arrangement was more or less inconvenient for all the Bishops. The consecration sermon was preached by Mr Horsley of Dundee, son of the famous Bishop; and afterwards published.

The new Bishop at once attacked the old abuses. It

seemed as if the long pent-up zeal for conformity—stirred to intensity by recent contact with Northern irregularity—must have immediate vent. He had no meeting with his clergy immediately after his consecration, as he "lay under the necessity" of "returning by Edinburgh"; but he was no sooner home than he wrote them a long circular pastoral letter (dated Nov. 18, 1808)*—a sort of primary charge, in fact—in which, with much force and plainness of speech, he expressed—as he says—"my thoughts on some parts of your public duty—thoughts, which I confess were suggested, by what I saw and heard whilst I was in your neighbourhood."

The letter is, in fact, an earnest and vigorously reasoned exhortation against deviations in public worship from the words of the English Liturgy, which forms "a collection of the most perfect liturgical offices that were ever used in the Christian world." "Yet I am afraid," says the Bishop, that some of us deviate widely from the words of that Liturgy; that we destroy the effect of its venerable antiquity, by modernising some of its expressions; that we interpolate the Liturgy, and other parts of the public service, with petitions, or clauses of petitions, composed by ourselves; and that we introduce occasionally, even into the most solemn offices, long prayers, which we have either copied from some private book of devotion, or received from some clergyman, to whom we have been accustomed to look up with reverence." The Bishop goes on to explain that, though he says *we*, he does not include himself. "I myself make no such interpolations." *He* would not attempt to improve the Liturgy in any way.

* The letter is engrossed at full length in the Minute Book of the diocese of Brechin (from which these extracts are taken), and it occupies upwards of nine closely-written quarto pages. The Bishop's letters to the clergy are all about the same length, and, with one exception, they are all entered in full.

"I do solemnly assure you that I feel myself utterly unable to compose a long prayer fit to be offered up to God in public; and that I would undertake to compose ten sermons fit to be preached before the most learned and accomplished audience on earth, rather than one prayer fit to be incorporated with our venerable Liturgy."

The English Liturgy "owed its excellence wholly to the judicious selection, which, at its revisal, from time to time, was made from all the Liturgies that have come down to us in the Greek and Latin Churches."

Herein also consisted the excellence of the Scotch Communion office. He preferred it to the English, "and I do so for the very same reason, that in the daily service, I prefer the naked Liturgy, to the same Liturgy disguised by the patches and interpolations of modern innovators." "It is a more faithful copy of the ancient offices, especially in the Greek Church"; "and were it in my power, without disturbing the peace of the Church, I would introduce it, not only into every Chapel in the diocese, but into every Church and Chapel in the British Empire." Yet, he continues, "truth compels me to add that I believe that the Lord's Supper may be validly, though not with equal solemnity and edification, administered by either form."

After recommending strict adherence to the English Liturgy, not only in the Daily Service, but also in the occasional services, he concludes with an earnest exhortation to careful catechising of the young, and preparation of them for confirmation.

An authoritative epistle of this description, either circulated among the clergy, as this one was, or read to them at their "annual meeting," two years out of the three

appeared, in those days of non-residence, to be the best substitute for personal presence and superintendence. Bishop Gleig, in the early years of his episcopate, sent a good many such letters to his clergy, and they are all duly engrossed in the minute book.

None of his writings are more characteristic of the man and the time. The style is in general clear, pithy, and direct, though occasionally somewhat disfigured by a rather stiff and formal Johnsonian period. The tone is authoritative, never warmly affectionate like Bishop Jolly's, yet it is in general sufficiently sympathetic and friendly, except in one or two cases, when he refers to certain unnamed, but incorrigible, offenders against order and rubrics; and then he waxes stern and minatory. The letters, as a whole, evince learning, sound sense, and decision. Like St Paul's, they are "weighty and powerful."

The next letter of this description was addressed to his Synod in 1810; and as it refers, like this one, wholly to diocesan matters, the notice of it will be most fitly introduced here. The letter sketched out what the minute terms "a plan by which their future meetings ought to be regulated." In reality, it was a scheme for putting the clergy through a regular systematic course of divinity, beginning with Natural Theology, and proceeding regularly through all the truths of Revealed Religion! The Bishop proposed that the Clergy should, if possible, meet twice a year, have service, with a sermon by one of their number, on a subject which he (the Bishop) should prescribe; and then, "at dinner," discuss the subject, and the treatment of it, among themselves. Going on, in this systematic way, and taking advantage of the excellent library left to the diocese by Bishop Abernethy Drummond, they would be able to "supply the defects of their

theological education"—acquire facility in "the not easy art" of composition; and learn to "think for themselves." "The power of *thinking* closely," he says, "has long appeared to me the great *desideratum* in our Church."

The Bishop began at once, and at the beginning, by propounding, with great precision, three theses in Natural Religion on the subject of the Being and Attributes of God, as to whether they are discoverable, and, if discoverable, demonstrable by human reason, independent of written revelation, &c., &c.

The clergy, at the meeting (at Montrose, May 2, 1810) at which the letter was read, "unanimously agreed to adopt the plan, and appointed to meet at Laurencekirk on the first Wednesday of August next."

They met there and then accordingly (August 1, 1810), and Mr Murray, whom the Bishop had suggested as preacher on the occasion, did preach; but this is the only indication given that the assembled clergy in any way carried out "the plan." The minute of the meeting consists of one short sentence, and does not even give the text or the subject of the sermon, far less any account of the discussion "at dinner." No reference whatever is made to the scheme, and none can be traced in the minutes of subsequent meetings. For the next two years, indeed, the diocesan Synods were much taken up with General Synod work; and a matter of this description might easily be overlooked. Probably the scheme was dropt after a short trial; and, in fact, it could hardly have been successfully carried out but by a resident Bishop. Non-resident administration—difficult at all times—was doubly difficult in the days of stage-coaches, dear postage, and small salaries.

CHAPTER VI.—1808-1811.

Immediate effect of his promotion—Endeavours to "banish Party Spirit" from Church—Proposes Meeting of Episcopal Synod—Synod meets—Delivers Primary Charge—Account of Charge—Its effect on Church—Applauded by Primus's Son—Criticised by Primus—Correspondence on Subject between Primus and Author—Between Primus and Son—General Synod of 1811—Bishop Gleig's part in same—Important letter to his Clergy.

HIGH office had at last come to Dr Gleig. *Sera tamen respexit inertem.* Though still strong, both in mind and body, he was past the years of elastic vigour and adaptability; and could hardly, in this higher sphere, "make full proof of his ministry." Bishop Skinner, who was only eight years his senior, had been already twenty-four years a Bishop. Still, such a man as Dr Gleig could not enter the College of Bishops, even at fifty-five, without soon making his influence there felt through the whole Church. And this he did happily with the best effect, and with general approbation. He, as has been seen, at once introduced into his own diocese some much-needed reforms; and he very soon took steps which paved the way for the introduction of like reforms into the constitution of the Church. He accomplished all this with the smallest possible party irritation and friction. He had himself suffered much from the influence of party spirit; and at times, no doubt, he yielded to the natural impulse to retaliate. On this occasion, however, he appears to have thought only of forgetting and, as far as possible, of effacing party altogether.

The following letter to Bishop Torry (June 19, 1809) breathes the true Christian spirit, and the reader will

presently meet several practical proofs of the sincerity of its averments.

"I wish we could hold a Synod on the Thursday [after the triennial meeting of the Friendly Society], for the purpose of revising our Canons, and contriving some method, if possible, of *banishing for ever from the Church that party spirit* which has prevailed in her to a greater or less degree ever since I had the honour to be one of her clergy. I am the more earnest in this because I had not been forty-eight hours a Bishop, when I was accosted by a leading Presbyter,* in a tone which to me indicated very plainly that he expected *me to thwart every measure, good or bad, that might be proposed by the Primus!* The gentleman to whom I allude never more completely mistook his man. When I agreed to be a Bishop, and the Primus agreed to consecrate me, I take it for granted that we both had resolved to bury in perpetual oblivion everything disagreeable that had formerly occurred between us; and I have no hesitation to say that, with respect to everything relating to the Church at large that has ever passed between the Primus and me, I agree with him to the minutest *iota;* I am not sure, though I wish to believe, that I do so with *all* my brethren. If we can banish party spirit from among us, and ambition, which, in such a Society as ours, is ridiculous as well as unchristian, we may yet, through the goodness of God, be able to raise our heads; and I wish to be the instrument, or one of the instruments, for accomplishing this good purpose."

The Synod,† which Bishop Gleig so much desired to see,

* Most probably the Rev. David Low. See postea, the controversies regarding the election of Bishop William Skinner.

† Of course, this was only an Episcopal Synod, or meeting of the Bishops. There had been no General Synod for sixty-six years. It was certainly high time to summon another; for the work done by this Episcopal Synod was pure General Synod work.

met at the time and place suggested by him; and in the conduct, as well as in the calling of it, he appears to have had matters very much his own way. The Synod met on Thursday, August 26. On the Tuesday, the Bishop had delivered, at Stonehaven, his primary charge to the Clergy of Brechin.* In the charge he indicated clearly the reforms which he thought most necessary for the Church at that time; and for these reforms provisions are found in the Canons passed by the Synod, mostly expressed in the very words of the charge.

In the charge (p. 17), the Bishop had said—"You all know that we are pledged to one another, and to the public at large, to make use of the English Liturgy in every office of the Church—that of the Holy Communion excepted; and some of you, doubtless, know that our *Primus*, when he was in London soliciting the repeal of the Penal Laws, and a legal toleration for our long-oppressed Society, solemnly assured those who were most active in carrying the bill through Parliament, that we adhere strictly to the English forms in everything, except the administration of the Lord's Supper, in which the Clergy are left at liberty to make use either of the English or of the Scotch form, as shall be most agreeable to themselves, and most edifying to the people amongst whom they minister. This assurance, and this pledge, I should consider as binding on my conscience, were the Book of Common Prayer a much less perfect form of public devotion than it confessedly is. . . . . Whilst you make use of these offices without additions, diminutions, or *improvements* of any kind, let me exhort you, &c."

Thus much for uniformity and conformity—

Then for order and legality.

* A charge . . . to the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion of Brechin. Edinburgh, 1809.

After stating (p. 29) that "a party spirit, were it once to prevail among us, would infallibly and speedily be productive of our utter extinction as a society," he proceeds, "such a baneful spirit cannot, indeed, be *widely* spread among us, if we keep constantly in our recollection the unquestionable truths, that the Clergy of one diocese have nothing whatever to do with the affairs of another; that every diocese, under its own Bishop, is a particular church; . . . and that" the "union" of "dioceses into National Churches is maintained only by the union of the several Bishops under the Divine Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, and by Canons enacted for the government of the several dioceses thus united in one body."

"From these facts," he continues, " . . it follows that when discord arises in any diocese, it belongs solely to the Bishop of that diocese, with the advice of his own Presbyters, to take what steps he may judge proper to restore peace and harmony—that neither the Bishop nor Clergy of any other diocese have the smallest right to interpose, unless expressly directed to do so by Canon, on behalf even of what they may think the injured party; and that, when any Presbyter deems himself injured by his own Bishop, the way to obtain redress is not secretly to stir up a party, either in the diocese to which he belongs, or in any other, but openly to appeal to the comprovincial Bishops and the representatives of the other clergy met in Synod, whose interest it is, as well as duty, in such cases to render impartial justice."

Of the six Canons passed at the Synod, the 1st, 2nd, 5th, and 6th were as follows.

1. That the clergy of one diocese receive no rule or direction from any Bishop or Priest of any other diocese, &c.

2. That they do not interfere directly or indirectly in the affairs of any other diocese, &c.

5. That they attend strictly to the Rubrics prefixed to the Communion office.

6. That they make no innovation on the services of the Church presently [at present] in use, but by the Bishop's consent and direction.

Thus, it is plain that this very needful and respectable measure of reform was due almost entirely to Bishop Gleig. And, by the publication of his charge, the Bishop paved the way for a larger and more complete measure.

The charge was well fitted to accomplish that purpose. It was a calm and dispassionate survey of the whole position of the Episcopal Church at the time, accompanied with wise counsels and practical suggestions as to the duties and difficulties of the clergy.

The Bishop had had abundant experience of the futility of controversy as a means of settling a theological or ecclesiastical dispute, and so the gist of his advice was *prevention*—the seeking, by clear law and regulation, to cut off the causes of disputes. "Theological controversy," he said, "very seldom produces much good, and is almost always productive of some evil" (p. 25), and "I have more than once, since I have been in Orders, known this poor Church brought to the brink of ruin by party spirit fermenting among her ministers" (p. 31).

The charge, though firm in tone, being yet far from dictatorial or aggressive, produced a great effect on the Church.

It was listened to not only by the Brechin clergy, but also by some of those from other dioceses. Many of the clergy from the south of course passed through Stonehaven that day, on their way to the meeting in Aberdeen on the

day following, and could thus, without inconvenience, attend the Synod and hear the charge.

Amongst those extra-diocesan clergy was Mr John Skinner of Forfar, the Bishop's late opponent at the Dunkeld election, and probably the Bishop had no more appreciative hearer. Mr Skinner says in his Annals (p. 484), "The whole clergy who heard" the charge, "as well as the parties to whom it was immediately addressed, requested the Bishop to publish it with all convenient speed." Mr Skinner himself was quite enthusiastic in his approbation.

But Mr Skinner's father, the Primus, viewed the matter with different eyes. The earnest counsels to close conformity did not approve themselves to his mind. "For the continuation of" "verbal alterations in reading the English service," "no man could have been a more zealous stickler than" he. And not unnaturally, "he having had not only the example and sanction of his own venerable father in framing his opinion as well as practice, but the example of the Bishops Alexander and Gerard—men for whom he ever entertained the greatest filial reverence."

No doubt, all those good and zealous men did what, in their difficult circumstances, seemed to them best for the good of the Church, and for the edification of their indigenous flocks. Adaptation is always a most difficult and complex question. On this occasion, the Primus thought Bishop Gleig wanted to carry conformity too far, "binding us down to a slavish resemblance of the Church of England in all but one point." This part of the charge, he thought, "seemed to have been framed with a particular view to its appearance on the south side of the Tweed."

Any assurance that he (the Primus) gave his friends in

England was only general, and could not be understood to imply strict adherence to "the English rubrics, or to the *ipsissima verba* of all the offices." Further, the Primus objected to the publication to an unfriendly world of the existence of diversity of practice and party spirit among the clergy. He wrote to Bishop Gleig (Jan. 3, 1810) to say all this and more to the same effect, sending him at the same time a copy of his charge of 1806, "plainly intimating his opinion of these matters," of which he "had never yet seen any cause to be ashamed."*

Bishop Gleig's answer to the Primus's letter the Primus's son pronounces *admirable*. And it certainly is so in every respect—matter, expression, spirit, and tone. It is an excellent specimen of the Bishop's style, being throughout clear, direct, and vigorous; but its chief value lies in the undoubted proof which it supplies, 1st, of the sound and sensible view which he took of the ritualistic question which tended to divide the North and South; 2nd, of his entire freedom from arrogance or factiousness in the maintenance of his view.

"Stirling, Jan. 15, 1810.—I received your letter of the third instant, together with your charge, &c. . . .

"There was not the smallest occasion for an apology for your remarks on my charge. I could make as many on yours, and support them, perhaps, with as cogent reasons; but I deprecate everything like controversy between us; which, as Johnson somewhere observes, though it may find men friends, seldom leaves them so; and I do think it of importance, not so much to ourselves as to the Church, that we continue friends. Let me, therefore, only state the principles and motives which guided me in the few

* Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, pp. 486-7, *et seq.*, where the whole correspondence is given at full length.

points on which you remark, and then drop the subject for ever. I admit that the words to the "brink of ruin" are strong, and I wish that they had been less so; but I really cannot admit that the whole of what is said on the baleful effects of party spirit . . . can lessen us in the estimation either of friends or foes.

"There never was a Church since the days of the Apostles, and never will be till the Millennium, totally free from party spirit; and to have held up ours as perfect in that respect would, I apprehend, have exposed both her and her panegyrist to contempt and ridicule. I might, indeed, have omitted the subject altogether; but in that case the charge would have wanted that which, not in my opinion only, but in the opinion of abler and less partial judges, is by far the most valuable thing in it. At your suggestion, I struck out or changed that clause in the manuscript which mentioned "a party spirit fermenting among us just now," a clause, by the way, for which your son thanked me even with tears in his eyes, and squeezed my hand in a manner that indicated gratitude, which I can never forget. You are so completely mistaken when you suppose that any part of the charge was framed with a view to its appearance on the south side of the Tweed, that I assure you there is not in England a copy for sale. . . . That I am desirous to enforce on the diocese of Brechin uniformity in reading the service of the Church is indeed most true; but that desire proceeds from no partiality to the Church of England, nor from a vain hope to equal her in anything but piety and sound principles; and I beg you to be assured that, though I hope to give, from time to time, such instructions to the clergy under my inspection as to my own unbiassed judgment appear requisite or expedient, I will never interfere with the

clergy of other dioceses, far less attempt 'to lay my colleagues under restrictions.'

"I am perfectly convinced in my own mind, and I have been so these thirty years, that nothing has done so much injury to our Church as the useless alterations which are made by many of the clergy in the daily service; but you seem to be of a different opinion, and have undoubtedly the same right to regulate your conduct by your conviction that I have to regulate my conduct by mine. Were these alterations the same in every chapel, or were they made upon any principle that could regulate the conduct of a stranger when occasionally doing the duty of his brother, something (I certainly think not much) might be said for them; but as every man in my diocese varied the form according to his own judgment or caprice, I found that I could not officiate for some of my own clergy without either showing the people that he and I think differently of our forms of prayer, or taking a lesson from him how to read before going in the morning into chapel! To such a length was this (to me most unaccountable) rage for innovation carried in some of the chapels of the diocese, that I was assured that the very communion service was interpolated with long prayers which, from the specimens of them, repeated by different people to me, surely were unworthy of a place in that solemn service; and to put a stop to such an absurd and pernicious practice, I wrote on coming from my consecration the letter which I now enclose to you. . . .

"You and I have often pleaded the cause of Catholic unity, and I hope we shall both do so again; but I do not see how we can do it with any effect among the people at large, if we set, I know not what kind of patriotism, in opposition to uniformity in prayer, or even uniformity of

dress. The people at large make not nice distinctions; and I see not why we may not adopt the daily service of the English Church verbatim, and even the decent habits of her clergy, to show that we are in full communion with her; as well as St Paul circumcised Timothy and purified himself in the Temple, to show that he was in full communion with the Church at Jerusalem."

This letter was at once respectful and firm. The Primus must have seen that the writer was not to be shaken in his resolution; so he sent "no direct reply" to the letter. He "alluded to the contents of" it "in his correspondence with his son at Forfar." But if he looked for any sympathy from that quarter, he found himself entirely mistaken. Instead of opposing Bishop Gleig in this matter, Mr John Skinner gave him his most ardent support. He was convinced that "the zeal of Bishop Gleig was according to knowledge;" and so he sat down and penned to his father a very long letter, in which he made it clear that, on the disputed points, his sympathies lay entirely with Bishop Gleig; and further, that he considered it his father's duty to convene a General Synod to settle these and all other disputed matters by authority, and "establish a general rule of conduct for all and sundry within the pale of the Church." "Were I," he wrote, ". . . a Bishop in the Church of God . . . I would not rest until an Ecclesiastical Synod or Convocation should be holden for the purpose of canonically settling all these points of Church discipline." . . . "I have no remedy within my reach; you, my dear Sir, certainly have. You can bring the matter to an immediate issue. You can assemble the parties who have the power of decision."

It was not to be expected that the Primus, who had so

long in Church matters been almost literally "a law unto himself," should take well these plain counsels as to law-making and law-abiding, even from his own son, and when accompanied with the most profuse professions of filial respect. Nor was it in human nature that he should escape a twinge of jealousy at the manifest predominant influence of Bishop Gleig in all these practical questions of the day. In answer, therefore, to his son's "long and elaborate epistle," he took only a brief and ungracious notice of his arguments, and then declared, "I must decline all further discussion of this subject, unless it come from another quarter. You have a Bishop of your own, ... and you would need to be cautious in appealing to me, as able in my official capacity to 'bring the matter to an issue,' lest you thereby confirm a jealousy, perhaps already excited, that *another* is, in fact, *the Senior Prelate*, and that I am only the late venerable Scottish Primus—Bishop Skinner!"

Notwithstanding his not unnatural hesitation to fall in at once with this onward movement from the South, a year had not elapsed before the Primus had agreed to convene a General Synod. He had come to see that this was the regular way to settle the disputed points, and once convinced of this, he acted with his usual decision and energy. All accounts agree that he presided over the Synod with great ability, impartiality, and tact.

The Synod met at Aberdeen, June 19th, 1811. The result of its labours was a Code of Canons, which, though still very imperfect, yet formed a great advance on the Code of 1743.

Canon XIII. made provision for the uniformity so much desiderated by Bishop Gleig. Canon V. at length conceded the claim of the Presbyters to a potential voice in

making the laws of the Church. This claim they had urged in vain for the last seventy years. There can be little doubt that it was chiefly to Bishop Gleig that this concession was due.

Speaking of this Synod of 1811, in his charge of 1829, he says, "As our Bishops are, and must be, in the present state of the Scotch Church, but few in number, it occurred to some of them, and *to myself in particular*, that her discipline might probably be more generally respected, if the Canons, by which it must be administered, were sanctioned as well by the Presbyters as by the Bishops."*

Thus, to a great extent, through the exertions of Bishop Gleig, had the Church been provided with improved Canons, and an improved instrument for Canon-making. But to do any good, the instrument must be used. The Synod must meet. The Canons, however, contained no provision for a stated or periodical meeting of the Synod. If there was to be a meeting, it was to be a special meeting, called by the Bishops when they saw fit. This is an arrangement which probably would not, in any circumstances, work quite satisfactorily. A council of war never fights; and a College of Bishops ever shrinks from the risks of change. How much trouble the difficulty of obtaining a meeting of the General Synod gave Bishop Gleig throughout his whole Episcopate—and how far it served to paralyse the energies of the Church, will be seen in the sequel.

The Bishop had no meeting with his clergy during the year 1811; but he addressed them a long letter (Sept. 19) explanatory of the recent reforms in the Code of Canons; and at the commencement of the letter he makes some incidental statements, which throw unexpected light on

* Charge of 1829, p. 12.

his past career, especially in connection with the diocese of Brechin.

1. He adds his own express authority to the indirect proofs which have been given, that he was the prime mover in those Canonical reforms.

2. He states, and, in fact, may be said to call his clergy to witness, that he had advocated those reforms five-and-twenty years before.

3. He further states that, as the advocate of those reforms, *he had been elected Bishop of Brechin five-and-twenty years before,* as well as three years before 1811.

After explaining what was meant by "decisive votes," the Bishop says—"The defective constitution of the Scotch Synods has appeared to me in a striking point of view ever since I was capable of forming any judgment on the subject; and I had determined, upwards of 24 years ago, that if ever I should be an officiating member of a Synod, I would propose the constitution which is now so happily, I hope, established. But whilst I take to myself the merit of *first suggesting* the election of delegates from the presbyters, and the division of the Synod into two Chambers,* that the clergy might have, by their representatives, a decisive voice in the enactment of Canons by which they are to be governed, let me not fail to do justice to my colleagues. The proposal was no sooner made than it was adopted by the Primus with the utmost alacrity; nor was there a word said against it, except by one Bishop, who immediately acquiesced as soon as he understood what was meant by the Primus and myself, when we

* He lived to doubt the wisdom of "the division of the Synod into two Chambers." (Charge of 1829, p. 13). The arrangement was confessedly adopted in imitation of the "Mother Church" of England (p. 12). Of course, it was the large Southern Convocation that was the model—not the small Northern one, which meets in one Chamber, as did the old Scotch Assembly.

talked of giving a *decisive voice* to the *representatives of the clergy.* I have thus, my brethren, performed what I believe you expected of me *so long ago as the year* 1786, *when you first did me the honour of electing me your Bishop,** and again when you elected me lately with greater success."

It is somewhat startling to come, for the first time, in 1811, on a statement in the Minute Book of the diocese, made by the Bishop, and in an incidental way, as if it were quite familiar to the clergy, that said Bishop had been chosen as Bishop by the clergy of the diocese twenty-five years before, as well as "more successfully" three years before. It is such a thing as this that indicates best the loose and careless way in which official Church proceedings were chronicled in those days. The Minute Book of Brechin diocese, which ought, on a mere reference to the date, to settle this question conclusively one way or the other, offers no real or positive evidence whatever on the subject. Such negative evidence, however, as its appearance presents is not only quite consistent with the truth of the Bishop's statement, but is even decidedly favourable to it. There occasionally occurs a gap of a few years in the Minute Book; in which case, instead of entries, we find blank pages. There is a gap of this sort from July 25, 1781, to Sept. 27, 1786; five pages and a half are left blank, and then a leaf *has been cut out.*

We see, therefore, that supposing the Bishop's alleged former election took place, as affirmed by him, there is nothing strange in our finding no entry of it in the Minute Book. The entry was either left out, or *cut* out.

* The italics here are not the Bishop's, but are used in order to draw attention to the statement.

But considering the way in which, and the peculiar circumstances under which, the Bishop's statement was made, it is hardly possible to conceive that there could be a mistake about it. The Bishop was addressing men to whom every circumstance connected with the elections in the diocese, at the time referred to, were either already familiarly known, or could, if a doubt was raised, be at once ascertained beyond question or cavil. The Minute Book shows that, at least, three of these Presbyters of the diocese, to whom the Bishop wrote, had been Presbyters and electors of the diocese in 1786. These men knew whether or not they had elected him that year; and the Bishop knew as well that he wrote subject to their certain, immediate, and authoritative correction. In point of fact, as has been already observed, he so wrote as if not they only, but all the clergy whom he addressed, were quite familiar with the fact of a first, as well as of a second, election of him by the clergy of the diocese.

The reality of that former election cannot, therefore, be reasonably doubted. It is certainly as well authenticated as any ecclesiastical event, not of first-class importance, could be expected to be, in a period of depression and confusion, when accurate records formed the exception and not the rule. It may be safely assumed to be as certain that Dr Gleig was elected for Brechin *twice*, as that he was elected once. And if so, he was in all elected Bishop at least *five times*—three times for Dunkeld, and twice for Brechin—before his election was at last confirmed, and he was actually made a Bishop. No single fact in the Church's annals probably is more characteristic of the times; nothing could give a better idea of the difference between now and then.

In his explanations as to the meaning and application of the new Canons, the Bishop is very precise, distinct, and decided. Times and Canons are changed; but some of the Bishop's remarks have still an interest, as showing the decisive stand which he took against liturgical irregularities. "The sixteenth Canon refers you to me for such *deviations* as may be made in the morning and evening service from the English Liturgy, in consequence of our Church not being *legally established;* but I see no reason for any such deviations. . . . On this subject, I refer you to my former pastoral letter, to which I expect *the strictest obedience to be paid.* You *have not,* and never shall *receive,* my authority for changing even a *which* into a *who,* or making any other change whatever."

He did not "approve of that custom, which the eighteenth Canon says prevails in most congregations of the Church, of having a particular *collect* for the days immediately preceding, and following, the administration of the Lord's Supper. No such collect, I believe, is used anywhere in the dioceses of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Fife; and I am not sure that such a practice does not *contribute* to deter the *timid* from approaching the Lord's table."

Yet, in the administration of baptism, "when children in health and vigour are baptized at home," he does not insist on the use of the whole office. "I would recommend the use of the whole office, omitting only the exhortation at the end; or, if that be thought too much, as by some parents it may be, you may say the well-known collect, 'Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings,' &c.; then proceed to the questions, 'Dost thou, in the name of this child,' &c., and so thence through the whole public office, omitting the exhortation at the end, as formerly."

CHAPTER VII.—1811-1817.

His relations with other Bishops—The Primus and Mr Milne, Banff—Administration of his own Diocese—Transition troubles —Stonehaven—Perth—Letter to Clergy—Death of Primus Skinner—Is chosen Primus—Aberdeen Election—Views of Bishops—Desires the election of a Southern man—Means by which this end was to be attained—Sides taken by Bishops— Discusses question of confirming Aberdeen Election—Leaves decision to Bishops Jolly and Torry—Consecrates Mr William Skinner.

THERE is in the Bishop's letters, of this period, satisfactory proof that, as a general Church ruler, he most rigorously observed his own Canon against meddling in the affairs of another diocese; and also that he continued to co-operate very harmoniously with the venerable Primus. The Primus had occasion to deal with Mr Milne, the clergyman at Banff, against whom a rather serious charge had been preferred, and Mr Milne looked for help to the southern Bishops. Bishop Gleig steadfastly refused to allow himself to be mixed up in the matter, and acted a manly, straightforward part towards both parties.

He wrote to Bishop Torry, Jan. 30, 1813—"I am exceedingly sorry for the difference which subsists between the Primus and Mr Milne; but I am an absolute stranger to the origin of the quarrel. Many months ago, I received from Mr Milne a letter informing me that he had proposed to refer the matter wholly to the arbitration of Bishop Sandford and me, and that he was preparing for us a statement of the case. I instantly wrote to him not to

give himself the trouble of writing out the case for me; because I had laid down a rule for myself never to interfere in the affairs of another diocese, nor to permit any of my colleagues to interfere in the affairs of mine. In consequence of this resolution, I assured him that I would not read his case were he to send it to me, and that I had reason to believe that Bishop Sandford would act on the same principle; and to convince him that I was influenced by no partiality to my own order, I added that I would make the very same reply to Bishop Skinner, were he to propose a submission of the case to my arbitration. I then exhorted him to reconcile himself to his own diocesan, if possible; because I neither would nor could do anything in the case unless it should unfortunately be brought before the whole College in the form of an appeal from the judgment of his own diocesan. That no misrepresentation might be made of my letter to the Primus, I sent it open under cover to him; and he was pleased to express his highest approbation of my conduct.

"As I heard nothing more of the matter for some time, I thought that the parties had been reconciled to each other, till about two months ago that the Primus wrote a long letter to me, relating in general terms Mr Milne's insolence and contempt of the Canons, his own journey to Banff, his resolution to suspend Mr Milne in terms of the Canon, and the legal threat and protest held out to him, if he should presume to pass any censure upon Mr Milne. As he asked my advice how to proceed in such a business, I earnestly recommended him to lay the whole case before Mr J. H. Forbes* before he should proceed any farther than he had done, offering, if he or Mr Forbes should wish it, to go to Edinburgh and converse with Mr Forbes

* Afterwards Lord Medwyn, father of the late Bishop of Brechin.

on the whole business, should he want for any information respecting the constitution of the Church. . . .

"I was sorry to learn, from a letter which I had from him lately, that he has not followed my advice, though he writes in terms of real gratitude for the attention which I had given to the case, and for the promptness of my letter; but he could not think, he says, of giving so much trouble to Mr Forbes, and had resolved to suspend Mr Milne if he should not make the proper concessions in three weeks."*

Though sometimes failing in patience and forbearance, the Bishop, on the whole, administered his diocese, not only with energy and firmness, but even with tact. There was need for these qualities, in a ruler, at the time when he entered on office. It was a transition period. Since 1805, union with the separate congregations had been going on; but in some places the union was as yet only *mechanical*. There was little sympathy between the two classes of Churchmen. Old prejudices took time for their removal. Each party had something to learn, and something to forget; and the general obstacles were sometimes aggravated by personal and local causes; for instance, when in a small town, two small congregations—one English and one Scotch—existed side by side—and personal antipathies or incompatibilities prevented their union into one strong congregation. This appears to have been the state of matters at Stonehaven, which at this time gave Bishop Gleig much trouble. Stonehaven contained two congregations—one, no doubt the late qualified one, presided over by an old clergyman, Mr Memyss, a Churchman only

* From all that the writer can learn about Mr Milne's case, it appears to have been one of discipline in the strictest sense. The result of it was that Mr Milne's connection with the Banff congregation came to an end, and he himself went abroad in the following year (1814).

in name—the other the native Scotch, the clergyman of which Mr Garden, whatever his principles might be, did not seem to be fitted by professional character or qualifications to unite the people. Then the two clergymen appear to have entertained a bitter feeling of antipathy towards each other, and everything tended—not to union, but to disunion and dispersion of both flocks.

The Bishop gives a full account of the state of matters, as they became known to him, on a visit to the place, and nothing could be less satisfactory. We, doubtless, see here the worst trials and troubles of the time.

It must be premised that Mr Memyss, though far better off than most of the clergy, had yet made application for one of the small grants which the Episcopal Fund then made to the more necessitous incumbents. This paltry matter seemed uppermost in his mind, prompting every word and act. The following is the Bishop's report of the state of matters :—

"On my arrival in Stonehaven," he writes to Bishop Torry, Dec. 6th, 1813, "in the course of my late visitation, I took an early opportunity to call upon Mr Memyss, whom I found, with his three daughters, extremely kind and attentive, not to myself only, but also to Mr Russell, of Leith, who was with me. As I was to remain over Sunday in the town, I told the old man that I would preach in his chapel in the forenoon, and confirm in Mr Garden's in the afternoon, expressing a hope that he would send his candidates thither. To this he most readily agreed; but observed that he had only *five* candidates for confirmation, a number which I faintly hoped to increase by my sermon. . . . . Mr Russell and I were often with them at breakfast and supper, and were always treated with the greatest kind-

ness, and with greater respect to me than I had looked for, or indeed could have desired from a man so much older than myself. We soon, indeed, had proofs of what I had long known—the deepest-rooted prejudices cherished by them all against Mr Garden, who, indeed, displayed prejudices at least as deep-rooted and rancorous against them. It was my wish, as well as my duty, to remove all these prejudices, or at least so far to lessen them as to prevent them being, what I am afraid they will be—*the ruin of Episcopacy in Stonehaven.*

"On Sunday forenoon Mr Russell and I took the whole of the old man's duty—Mr Russell reading prayers, and I preaching on Confirmation, a sermon as *high* as ever was preached by the Highest Churchman. Mr Memyss, his family, and indeed the whole crowded congregation (and it was very crowded), listened with the utmost possible attention; and instead of *five* candidates, twelve gave me their names in the vestry immediately after the sermon, and were all confirmed by me in Mr Garden's chapel in the afternoon. With my sermon Mr Memyss *professed* to be delighted, and made a kind of extempore exhortation to his people, to profit by what they had heard, and to attend me in the afternoon. As many of them as Mr Garden's chapel could hold in addition to his own congregation did attend, Mr Memyss's daughters being of the number; but none of the Memysses were confirmed, because (as the youngest informed Mr Russell), her sisters were Presbyterians, as she meant to become at the death of her father!

"We dined with Garden, and supped with the old man and his daughters; but neither of the two brethren asked the other to come along with us. In the evening the old man expatiated, with much apparent sincerity, on the

good that I had done that day; said that I had probably preserved the Church in Stonehaven, &c. Before I left the town, I exhorted Garden to humour the Memysses, as far as truth and duty would permit, and to be less austere and distant to the members of Memyss's congregation. This he promised faithfully, but probably performed it no more than another promise which he gave. . . . .

"After I had been six or eight weeks at home, without hearing from Mr Memyss, I felt it my duty to write to them both, exhorting them to unite the two congregations in the large chapel, each receiving from the joint emoluments a sum equal to what, on an average of some years, he receives at present from his separate flock. Perfectly aware, however, that neither of them can endure the other; that Garden is bent on bringing both congregations at Memyss's death to his own *chapel*, which would not contain the half of them; and that Miss Memyss, who seems to be her father's ordinary, dislikes Garden's *reading*, which is indeed very bad—I proposed to admit a young man, who has been urging me to ordain him these two years into Deacon's orders, provided he could obtain in the meantime a school in Stonehaven to support him, and succeed to the chapel at Mr Memyss's death. I even offered to procure for Memyss an annuity in the meantime. This alternative was proposed to the old man only in the *last resource*, should the two congregations refuse to coalesce into one; and I was at the utmost pains in the dictation of my letter to keep out of sight my Episcopal authority, and to offer my advice in the mere language of friendship, dictated by what he had so often said to me in his own house." But nothing could be done. "That Garden would oppose both these plans I was perfectly aware." He "talked of build-

ing a cross-aisle to his chapel to enable it to contain" both the congregations. "The congregation, however," the Bishop adds, "which at present adheres to Memyss will be lost long before his death, if something be not done immediately; and Garden's manners, both in the pulpit and out of it, are so generally disliked, that I am confident he would obtain not above half-a-dozen of that congregation to his chapel, were Memyss to die to-morrow. But what can I do? . . . Yet there is a fine field for a young man of decent talents and manners in Stonehaven —a field, indeed, so fine that Mr Russell said he would, if he had not been already settled, have offered himself as assistant to Memyss, and undertaken to make the congregation in a few years the best in the diocese, after Arbroath, Dundee, and Brechin."*

A few years previously (1810), the Bishop, acting for Bishop Torry, had had experience in another town of a state of Church matters, varying somewhat from this, but equally characteristic of that trying transition period, and even more discouraging. The remedy proposed by the Bishop was the same. In Perth the qualified congregation, after a good deal of negotiation, had as a body refused to "come in;" while "the few faithful" Churchmen, probably in prospect of union, had ceased to maintain a separate church. "Depending on a plan formed for

* The result appears to have been that, on the death of Mr Memyss, a few years after this period (about 1818), the two congregations formed a more or less complete union under Mr Garden, who held the united charge of Stonehaven till 1835. Mr Garden, though not shining as a reader or preacher, probably possessed considerable counterbalancing claims to respect and attachment. There is a very respectful reference to him in the Brechin Minute Book on the occasion of his death; and some, at least, of his people confided greatly in him. One of them told the Rev. George Sutherland that her sister used, when troubles came upon her, "to go to Mr Gairn's grave and pour them all out to him." The old lady "seemed to think it a great privation that she (living at Banchory), could not go and do likewise." (Letter to Writer from Rev. G. S.)

compelling the whole (qualified) congregation to do their duty," the Bishop had "advised the good people to go quietly for some time to the chapel." He had, however, at the time of writing (Jan. 14, 1810), more faith in a plan of Mr (afterwards Bishop) Low's, "to get a young man of decent manners and respectable talents to open a chapel in Perth under" the Bishop's authority. This would soon make the qualified people "glad to do their duty." "But, unluckily," he adds, "what was Mr Walker's (the late clergyman's) chapel *has fallen down*, and I know not where the rent could, for some time, be found for another house sufficiently large." "Something," he continues, "must be done, and done soon, or the few faithful people will be for ever lost to us."

"The young man of decent manners and respectable talents" was the great desideratum at Perth, as at Stonehaven.* A young man, untrammelled by inveterate prejudices and embarrassing claims, could at once fall into the new order of things, and thus might speedily cement a union between the two parties.

The clergy of the diocese of Brechin met at Brechin, August 3, 1814. The Bishop was not present, but the Dean read a letter of ten quarto pages from him on two subjects, both of great interest to the clergy and the diocese. The first was a fresh supply of books for the Diocesan Library, which the Bishop had obtained by "exchanging the worst copies of such books as you have duplicates and triplicates of, for others of value which you

* There was no congregation in Perth, subject to Bishop Torry's jurisdiction, till 1846, when a mission was opened in Atholl Street, by the Rev. J. C. Chambers. The English Congregation, under the Rev. G. Wood, united with the native Church in January 1849. The Cathedral at Perth was consecrated in December 1850, being, "with the single exception of St Paul's," the only Cathedral that had been consecrated in Great Britain since the Reformation. See Neale's Torry, pp. 300-338-367.

have not at all." The Bishop had encountered much greater difficulty than he had anticipated in negotiating this exchange, for he says, "I find that no bookseller will exert himself on any occasion when his *own interest* is not at stake."

But now, the books being procured, how were they to be read? This was an important question, as there was not one of them that was not more or less unsound. They were books for readers that could "think for themselves." The Bishop, therefore, explains in what manner, and for what purpose, such books should be "read at all." Then he points out the leading error in each of the principal works, and concludes by putting in an earnest caveat against too confiding and receptive reading.

"As *I chose* these books for you," he says, "and some of them are deemed not orthodox, you will readily forgive me for explaining to you the way in which they may be read with advantage, as well as the view with which such books should be read at all.

"I begin, then, with telling you that there is not one of the volumes which you will receive that does not contain something that is exceptionable, as well as much that is excellent; but every one of them is calculated to compel the serious and attentive reader to think for himself; and it is such reading only as produces this effect that is really valuable. Clergymen who wish to improve their knowledge in divinity do not read one or two approved works with the view of committing their contents to memory, as a child commits to memory the contents of the Catechism. It is the business of those who are to be the teachers of others to prove all things, that they may hold fast that which they really know to be good; and not to adopt as good, and without examination, the opinions of a mere

man, however eminent either for natural talents or acquired knowledge; for the Scriptures alone are entitled to implicit confidence. . . ."

Of Warburton, he says—"There are more paradoxes in Warburton's Divine Legation than in any other individual work which it would be easy to name; but there is likewise much useful truth, and a greater variety of learning and ingenuity, displayed in that work than in any other, perhaps, with which I am acquainted. In his great principle that the law of Moses, considered by itself and unconnected with the gospel, holds out no prospect of a future life to its votaries, he is unquestionably right; and, therefore, you find that the Sadducees were regular members of the Jewish Church in the days of our Saviour, and that occasionally they filled even the office of High Priest. But when he pushes this principle so far as to contend that *none* of the ancient Jews *knew anything about a future state*, he is as unquestionably wrong; for such of them as could pierce through the veil of the law to the reality of the gospel must have had the same notions of a future state that we have, though certainly not so clear nor so accurate. The number of those evangelized Jews, however, was certainly not so great as some of us suppose, though, I am persuaded, much greater than the Bishop imagined. Had he written his ninth book in the vigour of life before his astonishing talents began to decay, it would have been the most valuable of the whole; even as it is, if you throw away the childish hypothesis about the time necessary for the trees in the garden of Eden to grow, and some other superficial paradoxes, it is perhaps the best *rationale* that we have of the fall and redemption of man.

"As the Bishop first taught me to think for myself,

unawed by the authority of great names, I have a regard for his memory, and attempted, I think successfully, to vindicate his notion of *Justification* from the cavils of Archdeacon Pott, in his remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's *Refutation of Calvinism*. My defence of Warburton's theory is in the *British Critic* for April 1812.* . . . Warburton was a very inconsistent Churchman. His view of the Lord's Supper, which was excellent, certainly implies the divine authority of the Christian priesthood; and yet his sermons on Church Communion are suited only to the *liberality* of the present day. . . Taken altogether, he was undoubtedly a great man."

After stating his opinion of Paley's works, especially his Moral Philosophy, and saying that he sends them "Pearson's remarks on it" "as a kind of antidote" to the latter work, he concludes—"In a word, the books you will receive you ought to read with attention, but, at the same time, with caution; for my wish is that you *think for yourselves*, and not swear by any sect, or the founder of any sect. We are all Christians, and one is our Master, even Christ. We ought all to be humble, and even diffident; for *not one of us* is very learned, very acute, or of a judgment uncommonly sound. . . . . In human systems let us be *ecclesiastics*, and *dogmatists* only in what we are certain was taught by the Apostles and their immediate successors."

The other subject on which the Bishop wrote was that of the Royal Bounty, or Regium Donum,† a sum of £1200, which had been recently obtained from Govern-

* *British Critic*, First Series, vol. xxxix., p. 393—Review of "Remarks on two Particulars in a Refutation of Calvinism, &c., by a Friend to the Principles of that Work." The review occupies 16 pages of the *Critic*, and the latter half is entirely devoted to a defence of Warburton's Theory.

† See Bishop Jolly, p. 81.

ment for the Bishops and Presbyters—£600 for each order. "I wrote myself the petition which procured it," says the Bishop. He had also suggested a plan for the distribution of it; and he says, "My plan, if it be carried into effect, will convince you that I have not been biassed by *favouritism*, the rock on which Bishops are too apt to split." He had for this time recommended for the grant all the clergy of his diocese, whose circumstances entitled them to it, whether they were faithful and deserving or not; but he would not do so a second time. He had "kept his own secrets this time, it would be criminal to keep such secrets again." The delinquencies must in future "be faithfully reported to the stewards of this bounty."

These threats were directed against two unnamed offenders, who, he feared, could not, or would not be present to profit by them. "One of those to whom I allude *cannot* be present, and it is doubtful whether the other will *chuse* to be."

Bishop Gleig's policy was now decidedly in the ascendant, and the time was at hand when he himself was to be called to occupy the highest place in the Church. The venerable Primus, Bishop John Skinner, was cut off suddenly, July 13, 1816. Notwithstanding his advanced age (72), his death was an undoubted loss to the Church.* Age had but slightly abated his energy, whilst it had greatly enlarged his tolerance. His sympathies had widened with the widening of the Church under his own hand. This was made manifest at the Synod of 1811. The men from the South found him a different man from what they expected—by no means unconciliatory, but

* The reader will probably see cause, as he proceeds in the narrative, to agree with the Writer in thinking that the death of Bishop Skinner was a greater loss and misfortune to Bishop Gleig than to any other man in the Church.

quite ready to yield what "he might have retained without reproach," "for the sake of peace and union," and "general conciliation."*

The late Primus had found the Church shackled, and he left it free. It was still, however, very far from being completely united and homogeneous. Matters were still in a transitional state. The removal of such a man was therefore a trial of the Church's stability and cohesion. Two important offices had to be filled—the Primusship and the bishopric of Aberdeen. The first was filled very quickly and very quietly, and apparently with the general concurrence of both North and South. Bishop Gleig was appointed Primus at an Episcopal Synod held at Aberdeen, August 20, 1816. The election appears to have been unanimous. Bishop Sandford had aspired to the office; but it is not said that he, or any one else but Bishop Gleig, was proposed for it. There were other good men in the College; but not one of them had the combination of high qualities—the learning, the ability, the energy, the zeal, and the business capacity which are always desirable in a first Bishop. Bishop Gleig had them all, and a name to adorn the office. "The distinction," says Lawson, "was justly conferred on one of the most distinguished theologians and metaphysicians of the day, whose high reputation shed a lustre on the Church, &c." (History, p. 381.)

The appointment to the diocese of Aberdeen was not settled in so quiet and satisfactory manner. There was, indeed, no difficulty with the diocese itself, which made its election quietly and regularly, and almost unanimously, the majority being twelve to two. The Bishop-elect was the Rev. William Skinner, son of the late Bishop. The

* Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, p. 485.

difficulty arose as to the confirmation of the election by the Episcopal College. Unfortunately for himself, the Primus, notwithstanding his own bitter experience of the evils of undue interference with the free choice of a diocese, showed a disposition to continue the mistaken practice. Whatever the Canons in their vagueness might permit, the day was past for such things. It must be said, however, in justice to the Primus, that his action on this occasion never went beyond influence and persuasion. It has, undoubtedly, been much misunderstood. Probably the impression left by the history of the Aberdeen election of 1816, as usually related, is, that the Primus stood alone in his opposition to the promotion of Mr William Skinner, and that the only ground of his opposition was an Apostolical Canon (to which he made some reference) forbidding a son to succeed his father in the Episcopate. In reality, the case, as regards both the election and the confirmation of the election, stood thus.

I. With the exception perhaps of Bishop Macfarlane, probably all the Bishops were, for one reason or another, unfavourable to the election of Mr William Skinner for Aberdeen.

The Southern Bishops, backed by all the leading Southern clergy, opposed it for these reasons :—

1. The North had already its own share of Bishops—Aberdeen diocese had still two; and, in justice to the South, the new Bishop, it was thought, should be taken from the South, where there were, at the time, two or three able, learned, and zealous priests admirably fitted for the Episcopal office.

2. The Skinner family were still generally somewhat unpopular in the South; it being thought that they were too much wedded to the Northern tradition to work har-

moniously with the South, and carry on the work of union.

It was chiefly, if not entirely, by the first of these reasons that the Primus was influenced. He was exceedingly anxious to have one or other of his two friends, Mr Walker, Edinburgh, or Mr Low, Pittenweem, raised to the Episcopate. For this reason, he used all his influence to have Bishop Torry chosen for Aberdeen; and when that Prelate's election seemed improbable, he then worked for Mr Walker, Edinburgh, who, he suggested, might be Bishop of Aberdeen, and co-adjutor Bishop of Edinburgh.

Had Bishop Torry become Bishop of Aberdeen, Dunkeld would have become vacant; and either Mr Walker or Mr Low would, it was confidently expected, be elected to it. But to provide against the possibility of an election altogether unacceptable to the South, steps were taken by the Southern Bishops to provide a trustworthy sub-diocese.* The district of Fife was to be disjoined from Edinburgh, and Mr Low, it was believed, "would certainly be elected" to it. Had Mr Low been consecrated to Fife, the number of the College would have been complete, "as by the regulations of the Episcopal Fund, the College was restricted to the number six." Dunkeld would then have been united to Fife, as Fife has since been united to Dunkeld. And "the presbyters of Aberdeen," if they had not already done so, would have been "under the necessity of electing either

* "Bishop Sandford, hoping, as we all hoped, that you would be chosen Bishop of Aberdeen, resigned, by a formal deed, addressed outwardly to me, but inwardly to us all equally, the district of Fife . . . earnestly recommending Mr Low to succeed him," &c.—Primus Gleig to Bishop Torry, Sept. 18, 1816. The same project was revived, at the next vacancy, three years afterwards. It was not carried out on this occasion, because no opening was made for it. Aberdeen did *not* elect Bishop Torry, and so Dunkeld did not become vacant; neither did the Bishops, as a body, decide to nullify the election of Mr William Skinner for Aberdeen. Had either of these events taken place, a mandate might have been issued to Fife, and, in that case, either Dunkeld or Aberdeen would, for the time, have been deprived of its choice of a Bishop.

you (Bishop Torry) or Bishop Jolly, or of contenting themselves without a proper diocesan, you two as *Proximi* performing Episcopal offices among them."

II. Thus matters stood till the result of the election was known. Then came the question of confirmation. Of the five Bishops, Bishop Macfarlane, it was quickly known, was decidedly in favour of confirmation; and Bishop Sandford decidedly against it. The two Aberdeenshire Bishops had not spoken.* The Primus himself, though it was plain that he was exceedingly averse to confirm, yet manifestly felt that it would, in the circumstances, be altogether unjustifiable to reject. He therefore stood uncommitted to absolute rejection; but he had unfortunately, and, as he afterwards confessed, very wrongly, "promised to Bishop Sandford that, if any two of the College be against him, he cannot and shall not be consecrated." He had made the same promise to Messrs (afterwards Bishops) Low and Walker, who had, he said, sent him a message by Mr (afterwards Bishop) Russell, threatening him with the loss of their friendship, should he consent to consecrate Mr Skinner.

The confirmation now depended on Bishops Jolly and Torry; and certainly the Primus did nothing to influence either of these Prelates against it, but the reverse. When he heard from the Rev. Mr Annand, Aberdeen, that Mr Skinner was likely to be elected, he wrote a letter to Bishop Torry,† which, he said, might also be shown to Bishop Jolly, in which he said—"Everything that I have seen or heard of Mr William Skinner induces me to

* That is, they had expressed no opinion as to the duty of *officially confirming* the election, now that it was regularly made. This was a different question altogether from that of approving, as individuals, *the making* of the election. (See letter of Primus's, p. 300.)

† Sept. 3, 1816.—Torry Collection.

believe him to be an excellent young man, worthy of the degree to which he probably aspires; and were he elected, I know not how we could refuse him." After the election, he wrote a very long letter to Bishop Torry,* which he was to "take a ride to Fraserburgh, and show to Good Bishop Jolly." In this letter the Primus goes into all the pros and cons of confirmation, and the only impression it can have left on his venerable correspondents' minds was, to use his own words, "I know not how we can refuse him." The only reason for "refusing" was this. "If we sustain it (the election), we shall probably lose for ever the services of two men as Bishops who, in my opinion, are decidedly the fittest for the office of any two presbyters in the Church."

Something might, in those days, have been made of this reason on the elastic plea to which the Primus refers, that in a conflict of interests, the individual must always yield to the Church; but the Primus makes no attempt to do so. On the contrary, he makes it perfectly clear that to act on such a plea would be to inflict a great and certain injury on Mr Skinner, in order to compass a doubtful benefit for the Church.

On the two questions of the regularity of the election and the Canonical unobjectionableness of the Bishop-elect —the only two questions with which in reality the Bishops had anything whatever to do—his views were equally clear and favourable. Against the regularity of the election he had not one word to say; and as to the Bishop-elect he was not only unobjectionable, but *good*. He was "a gentle-tempered, unambitious young man, of moderate learning, &c." Finally, he comes to the most just and satisfactory conclusion—"To Bishop Jolly and you he

* Sept. 18, 1816.—*Ibid.*

(Mr William Skinner), must be known thoroughly, and by your joint testimony I shall certainly be guided." What that joint testimony was likely to be he could have had but little doubt; and when it came, he acted on it faithfully and promptly. On October 15th he wrote Bishop Torry—"I received your excellent letter in course of post, and two days afterwards another of the same description from Bishop Jolly. It is a pleasure to correspond with such men, men who can be firm without violence, and who prefer public justice to private prejudices. I regret, as you both do, the issue of the Aberdeen election; but I agree with you likewise that, all circumstances considered, it is our duty to confirm it; and Bishop Sandford being now decidedly—*i.e.*, in two letters —of the same opinion, I propose that the consecration should take place either on Sunday the 27th instant, or on Wednesday the 30th." It took place on the 27th—and thus this much vexed and once threatening affair was happily settled.

But it left its evil effects. It gave rise to a temporary coolness between the Primus and his two intimate friends, Messrs Walker and Low; and to not a little misunderstanding and misrepresentation of the Primus's conduct in the matter. In order to set himself right in the eyes of the leading men in the Church at least, the Primus drew up a narrative of his whole action in the matter of the election, with corroborative letters and copies of letters. He transmitted the document to Bishops Torry and Jolly; but Bishop Jolly, who was ever busy pouring oil on the troubled waters, thought it advisable to dissuade the further circulation of it at that time.

The Primus endeavoured to turn the lesson of the election to account in the best way, by endeavouring to obtain

more distinct and definite rules and regulations for the conduct of elections. At the close of the letter fixing the day of consecration, he says to Bishop Torry—"I have another obligation to propose, and likewise an alteration in the mode of conducting the election of Bishops, which, if approved by my colleagues, will, without encroaching on the rights of the Presbyters, go a great way to prevent such discussions for the future," &c.

What the alteration was does not appear, nor how far it was or could be adopted by the Bishops without the consent of the General Synod. The great alteration that was wanted was one to define clearly and distinctly the functions of the Episcopal College in the matter of an election. It was vain, however, as yet to expect any alteration of that sort.

The same year, 1816, the Primus had a good deal of trouble about the use of the Scotch Communion Office in Brechin. In order to preserve peace and harmony, he himself wished to authorise the clergyman, Mr Moir, to use the English Office; but the Canon required that he should first have the consent of the majority of his colleagues. This he could not obtain—the four Northern Bishops opposing. The matter was settled in a very friendly way by the Bishops.

CHAPTER VIII.—1817-19.

Publishes a new edition of Stackhouse's History of the Bible—His contributions to the Work—Analysis of the Dissertation on Original Sin—Notice of his other chief dissertations—Reception of the Work in England, and in Scotland—Bishop Howley—Bishops Jolly and Torry—Death of his eldest son—His younger son completes his studies at Oxford, and takes orders—Troubles with the office and the title of Primus—Mr John Skinner publishes his Annals—Desires "imprimatur" for the Book from Bishops—Mr Bowdler.

In the year 1817 Primus Gleig completed another great literary undertaking, akin to that of editing the *Encyclopædia Britannica*—the issue of a new edition of *Stackhouse's History of the Bible*. It is needless to say that this was a work of great labour and research. Many years had elapsed since the body of the history was compiled, and much had to be done to bring the work up to the standard of the altered times.* Great progress had, in the interval, been made, not only in Biblical criticism, but in all the sciences that bear on the history and interpretation of the Bible. Of course, the progress in the same sciences since the date of the Bishop's edition has been incomparably greater still; such sciences as that of language and geology, for example, having been entirely revolutionised. This is a fact that must be carefully borne in mind in estimating the value of the Bishop's editorial labours. The best explanations of his day must now give place to better.

* The first edition of Stackhouse's History was published in 1732. The last edition before that of Dr Gleig was issued, it appears, in 1767. Stackhouse himself died in 1752.

But yet, not a little of the Bishop's part in the work, such as his dissertations on doctrinal matters, remains unaffected by the lapse of time; the authorities being much the same now as then. This will be seen from the following brief account of the principal dissertations which he contributed to the work. Of these dissertations, that on Original Sin is the most characteristic, the most original and striking; and it deserves a careful perusal, if only for the learning and acuteness which it abundantly displays.

Original Sin, the Bishop makes out to be, in reality, no sin at all, but rather misfortune—the loss of God's favour and help, and the forfeiture of immortality.

Man was "not naturally immortal;" but a promise of immortality was implied in the threat, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."* The death here threatened was "the death of the whole man—of the soul as well as of the body." This complete dissolution was Adam's punishment. His posterity inherit his mortality; but they do not inherit his *guilt* or his depravity.

"The transmission of real guilt from father to son . . appears to be utterly impossible." No man can be guilty of a thing that was done before he was born. And to say that guilt is not conveyed but imputed, so "far from lessening the difficulty, aggravates it greatly." "Guilt cannot be *imputed* to an innocent person, but through ignorance or malice; from ignorance and malice, the wisest of all beings is perfectly free."

The Bishop then examines, one after another, all the texts of Scripture which are usually adduced in support of

* These words, "Dying, thou shalt die," occur at least twenty-nine times in the books of Moses; but "no man will contend that the words imply anything more in twenty-seven of these verses than *that death* to which man and the inferior animals are equally liable, &c."

the doctrine of transmitted or imputed guilt, and maintains that all of them that really apply to the subject, admit of a figurative interpretation.* He follows the same course with the proofs of transmitted depravity, and arrives at the same conclusion. The passages were all more or less figurative, and the corruption referred to was "not derived, but self-produced."†

He concludes, therefore, that Original Sin means no "more than the loss of immortal life—of the grace of the Spirit—and the teaching of God; and that this conclusion, whilst it involves in it nothing contrary to our original notions of right and wrong, shall be shown afterwards to lay a more solid foundation for the Christian doctrine of Universal Redemption, and for the necessity of Divine Grace, so resolutely denied by the ancient Pelagians and modern Unitarians than the doctrine either of *imputed sin* or of *inherited depravity*." (Vol. I. p. 103.)

The dissertation here referred to, in which the Bishop claimed to prove thus the harmony of "the effects of the atonement" with "the consequences of the fall" as here explained by him, is that "on some of the principal doctrines of the Christian religion." (Vol. III. pp. 360–90). That dissertation ought, in order to do justice to the Bishop's system of doctrine, to be read in connection with this one on Original Sin.

The Atonement, he argues there, restored to man all and more than all that he had lost at the Fall. First and chiefly it restored "the free gift of immortal life," and

* Romans v. ἁμαρτία is "often employed to denote *suffering* for sin, and not the *guilt* of it." Ephesians ii. 3—Does not "make so much as *an allusion* to the sin of Adam." Psalm li. 5—"From his earliest years of discretion the author had been a great sinner."

† Gen. vi. 5, 11, 12; Psalm lviii. 3; Isaiah xlviii. 8—(against these two latter passages the Bishop sets Job xxxi. 18; Eccles vii. 29).

placed it "on a surer tenure," it being held now, not "on the precarious tenure of any mere man's obedience to any law, whether positive or moral, but as 'the gift of God,' once for all bestowed on the human race, &c."—(III. 367.) —a gift, not to a part of mankind, but to the whole, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

It further restored to man the "graces of the Holy Spirit," and "the teaching of God," necessary to fit him for Heaven. "If by the commission of wilful sin we fall from that state of Salvation into which we were admitted at our baptism, we may be restored to it—by repentance and faith, which we are not sure that under the first covenant we could have been." (III. 389.)

And grace is given to help in every time of need. To support the life of the soul in us, we may, as in Paradise, eat of the tree of life; we may, through the prayer of faith, draw constant supplies of grace from the appointed fountain. It is plain from all he says that grace was as necessary to Bishop Gleig's system as to any system. For he admitted that, however he may have been born, "every man naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam is very far gone—even before he arrives at the years of discretion—from original righteousness." The Bishop differed, in fact, very little from any of his brethren as to the state in which the gospel and the Church find man. He would not admit original guilt or original depravity, but he freely admitted original "weakness," original helplessness, and liability to death. Man, as he is, could do nothing "of himself."

In addition to these two important dissertations, the three volumes contained about twenty others of considerable length, besides foot notes and corrective interpolations

in the text. Of these papers, the most important were the following:—

1. On the sacred chronology, profane history, the learning, religion, idolatry, and monumental writing, chiefly of the Egyptians, from the migration of Joseph to the Exodus (I., 489-500).

This dissertation displays great learning, research, and acuteness, and, for the age, is a very creditable essay. It touches on the origin of written language—"the Bishop leaning to the idea of an original language* falling into disuse with the dispersion from the primitive settlement, and gradually supplanted, through picture-writing and hieroglyphics, by a multitude of distinct languages."

2. On the conduct and character of Balaam (I., 606-20). Contrary to most modern commentators, but in agreement with several distinguished ancient ones, the Bishop maintains that "Balaam was an *idolater*, who had never been a conscientious worshipper, far less a true prophet, of the true God." He shows, also, how naturally the Jews fell into idolatry—the worship of their neighbours being only a debased worship of Jehovah—and they easily persuading themselves that there was little harm in mixing up the false with the true—the worship of Baal with the worship of El.

3. On the duration of the Jewish Theocracy (Vol. II., 158-161). "An excellent argument."

4. Introduction to Vol. III., p. i.-xxviii. A very able defence of the ways of Providence in gradually preparing the world for the coming of Christ—merging into a defence of the authenticity and trustworthiness of the New Testament history.

* The impossibility of a common origin of language has never been proved."—Max Müller's Science of Language, p. 326.

5. A long and able essay on the origin of the first three gospels (III., p. 84-113). The writer maintains that all the three were written independently of each other.

6. An able and argumentative essay on our Lord's miracles, dealing chiefly with some new objections to miracles raised in a recent review of Laplace in the *Edinburgh Review*. (III. 240–254.)

7. An account of the constitution and discipline of the Primitive Church, forming an able vindication of Episcopacy. (III. 500-507.)

On the whole it appears that the Bishop's editorial labours were well appreciated; though, as was to be expected, his views on the subject of Original Sin were subjected to a keen canvass. "The book," says the Ex-Chaplain-General,* "made a considerable sensation in England. In those days, Orthodoxy was very rigid. Any theologian who ventured to think for himself, especially on the subject of Original Sin and the consequences of the Fall, was denounced as a heretic; and from this censure the Bishop did not escape. A number of unknown writers assailed him, of whom he did not think it worth while to take notice. But Dr Howley, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and then Bishop of London, objected to my father's views in private correspondence, and was besought to publish his criticism, in order that out of an amicable controversy truth might be elicited. This he declined to do; and my father was thus prevented from rebutting, as he desired to do, the charges brought against him."

With the exception of Bishop Skinner, none of the Primus's Episcopal colleagues seemed to regard his views on Original Sin as of much practical significance.

* Letter to the writer of this memoir, Nov. 30, 1876.

Two years after this time, the Primus repeated his exposition of them in a charge, and Bishop Jolly read the charge without "having perceived in it anything obnoxious," but rather "the contrary."*

What Bishop Torry thought of the views, we learn from his son. "I remember," says Dean Torry, "when Bishop Gleig published his edition of *Stackhouse*, he presented a copy of it to Bishop Jolly and my father, between them, and Bishop Jolly kept it. I was then my father's curate, and he employed me to copy the dissertation on Original Sin, before he sent the book to Fraserburgh. I remember saying to him at the time, "Do you think the Bishop sound on this point?". To which he answered, "He is sound enough, but he has his own way of explaining it." †

. This year the Primus suffered a great bereavement in the loss of the elder of his two sons, Lieutenant Alexander Gleig, who died in the camp in Dermeer, India, Sept. 3rd, 1817. Mr Gleig appears to have been a very amiable and promising youth. The Primus says of him, "From the elder I never received cause for a day's serious uneasiness till I heard of his death." (Letter to Bishop Torry, March 4, 1819).

The Primus had much comfort, however, from this time in his younger son, George Robert,‡ who had now left the

* See Memoir of Bishop Jolly, chap. vii. p. 97.

† Neale's Torry, pp. 22-23.

‡ George Robert Gleig "was born at Stirling, 20th April 1796. From the University of Glasgow he proceeded, when scarcely fifteen, in 1811, on the Snell Foundation to Balliol College, Oxford. In 1812, his desire to join the Duke of Wellington's army in the Peninsula overmastered his taste for the classics, and being appointed to an Ensigncy in the 85th Regiment, he took part in its late campaigns. He afterwards served in America, and was present at the capture of Washington in the action near Baltimore, and throughout the operations before New Orleans. In the course of these services he was wounded several times. Returning home, he completed his studies at Oxford, and was nominated by the Archbishop

army, and returned to Oxford to complete his terms. "The talents of the younger," he says in the same letter, "were always very superior to those of the elder." He appears all along to have fully understood and appreciated the gifts and capacity of his second son, and to have grieved greatly when for a time he exchanged the pen for the sword. He now took a lively interest in his professional labours and pursuits, and rejoiced with true paternal delight in his literary fertility and success. He also derived much gratification from an occasional visit which he paid to his son in England, and still more, from the frequent visits which his son paid to him in Scotland, the latter being, when possible, so timed as to fall in with the father's visitation of his diocese, when youthful vigour and activity were very serviceable in the smoothing of the daily difficulties of locomotion.

Hitherto the Primus had, as he wrote to Bishop Torry,

of Canterbury to the perpetual Curacy of Ash, in Kent, and to the Rectory of Ivy Church, in the same county. It was during the early years of this charge that he wrote his 'Subaltern,' in point of time, as of merit, one of the first of those military novels, which have since become so popular. The 'Subaltern' described, from the author's own experience, the closing scenes of the Peninsular War. It had been preceded by a narrative of the Campaign in America; and its success first brought the earlier work into notice. Both works were distinguished, not only by literary skill and vivacity, but by a literal accuracy, which gives them a high value in the eyes of the professed historian. Onward from the appearance of the 'Subaltern' and its signal success, Mr Gleig combined with the discharge of his clerical duties an assiduous cultivation of authorship. He has contributed extensively to fiction, history, biography, periodical criticism, and has published more than one volume of sermons, as well as a history of the Bible."—*Imperial Dictionary of Biography.* The titles of some of Mr Gleig's works may be added—"Chelsea Pensioner," "The Country Curate," "The Chronicles of Waltham," "Allan Breck." Then in history—"A history of the British Empire in India," "Military history of Great Britain," Campaign of New Orleans, "Story of the Battle of Waterloo," "Leipsic Campaign," "Sale's Brigade in Affghanistan," &c., &c., &c. Mr Gleig was appointed Chaplain of Chelsea Hospital in 1834; Chaplain-General of its Forces in 1844; and Inspector-General of Military Hospitals in 1846. The two latter important appointments he held with great credit for about thirty years. He now lives in well-earned retirement at Deane House, Micheldever, Hants.

found his "Primacy a source of so much vexation to him, that he had a strong desire to resign it." As to the vexation which the office had caused him during his first three years' tenure of it, it was undoubtedly great. It would have probably been very small, had he only discerned the signs of the changing times, and rigorously avoided and discouraged all interference with the free choice of a Bishop by the electors of a diocese. He would, in that case, have been spared a deal of worse than fruitless trouble and annoyance, and some painful disagreements and estrangements.

But not only the office, but also the title of Primus gave him trouble. He thought *Primus* did not combine well with Bishop in a signature, and was unintelligible to an Englishman. He, therefore, cast about for an equivalent for the title, taking care to avoid any variation which could be mistaken for Primate, knowing well that his colleagues were strongly opposed to the restoration of the office of Primate, and would look with suspicion on the revival even of the title. But while he himself was careful on this point, some newspaper writers, ignorant or regardless of the precise significance of titles, boldly "dubbed him Primate." They were followed by Longman, the publisher of his edition of *Stackhouse*, who, at least, was not ignorant nor regardless of the greater commercial value of the higher title. *Stackhouse* came out as edited by "The Primate of the Episcopal Church of Scotland." The effect of this misnomer was to excite unfounded suspicions in the mind both of the Primus and that of, at least, one of his colleagues. Bishop Skinner wrote to Bishop Torry (Nov. 1816)—"After what was said at Stirling about the title of *Primate*, it was with no little surprise, and, I confess, grief, that I see he

still advertises his edition of *Stackhouse* with the appendage of *Primate* of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, in addition to his other titles. . . . . Were personal vanity only concerned, he might be allowed to gratify it; but I confess to you I have my fears of something farther lurking under the assumption of the title."

The Primus's own feeling in the matter was, "An enemy hath done this!" Writing to Bishop Torry, Dec. 7, 1816, he says, "When I found myself dubbed *Primate*, first in an English paper and then in a Scotch one, I immediately attributed this piece of foolish flattery to one or other of the two ——s. . . Whoever acted that foolish part was no friend, or, at least, no judicious friend, to me or the Church. . . . As my son passed through London to Oxford, he called at the shop of Longman & Co., and found me styled Primate of the Episcopal Church in Scotland on the cover of the first part of my edition of *Stackhouse's History;* and of this he gave me instant information, exulting in it, with all the vanity not unnatural in one so young. I lost not a moment, but wrote by the return of the post to Longman & Co. to cancel that title, and design me as I had been designed in the prospectus of the work, *one of the Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland;* and, to make sure of the matter, I wrote by the same post to Mr Bowdler to call on Longman & Co., and explain the reason of my order more fully than I could do to *them* in a letter. I had immediate answers from both assuring [me] that my order should be obeyed; and Longman, who wrote that he took the title of *Primate* from a newspaper, regretted that a few of the numbers of the book were in circulation, though he said *only* a few, before the receipt of my letter."

About two months after this, the Bishop had to sign, apparently for the first time, as Primus, a public document, viz., an address presented by the College of Bishops to the Prince Regent on his escape from assassination. How to designate himself on this formal occasion was a difficulty on which he bestowed not a little attention, and which, after all, he got over but indifferently well. Writing to Bishop Torry about the address (Feb. 14, 1817), he says, "You will observe that I have called myself *Primary* Bishop; and my reason was that an Englishman cannot be made to understand the meaning of *Bishop and Primus*. Had I called myself *Primus* alone, it would have been read *Primas*, translated *Primate*, and all the obloquy brought on me by the false or injudicious friend in the newspaper revived. Bishop Sandford advised me to write, as Bishop Skinner wrote on such occasions, *Senior Bishop*, and this was my own intention, till I recollected that, as in one sense, that phrase would have expressed what is not literally true; my two quondam friends would, in their present humour, have charged me with palpable falsehood. The word *Primary* is a literal translation, and the most modest translation that can be given of the word *Primus;* and therefore I hope, but am far from being confident, that I shall escape obloquy on this occasion."*

On the next occasion of an address to Royalty, the Primus signed himself *Premier Bishop;* which seems a decided improvement on *Primary*, though, as may be supposed, it was by no means more acceptable to his colleagues. Premier, however, lent itself readily to a gentle

* The letter from which the above is extracted is printed in Neale's Torry (p. 94-5); but the word *Primary* is there misprinted, first *Primus and* and then *Primate*, thus making utter nonsense of the whole passage.

joke or touch of humour, and thus helped to give a good-natured turn to the question.*

The year 1818 was comparatively uneventful in the Church. Mr Skinner of Forfar published his Annals of Scottish Episcopacy during his late father's administration. Before publication, Mr Skinner had addressed a circular to the Bishops, requesting them to grant their *imprimatur* to his book.

On this subject the Primus had written to Bishop Torry (August 15, 1817), "You remember Mr Skinner's *circular*, which you undoubtedly received, proposing that we, as Bishops of the Scotch Church, should grant our *imprimatur* to his life of his father! With the greatest possible respect for the memory of the late Primus, this is a proposal to which I never can agree; but I offered, long before the appearance of that circular, to read his manuscript, make what observations on it might appear proper, and give my candid opinion of the work as a private friend; and this I am extremely ready to do still, either in his presence, or, what would be much better, studying the MS. at leisure in my own study."

* The office of Primate being merely an ecclesiastical appointment, the establishment, or the restoration, of it is a question of expediency, to be determined in each case by the circumstances. In Scotland the circumstances are somewhat peculiar. Consider:—

1. The history of the office in the country. It was only established a short time before the Reformation (1472), and then restored for a time under the Stuarts (1610). Thus, it was associated in the minds of the people with stormy and divided times, and arbitrary and persecuting rule.

2. The greatly reduced condition of the Church as to numbers, embracing, as it did and does, only about 2 or 2½ per cent. of the native population.

3. The ingrained habits and ideas of the people in the matter of government; accustoming them to strict law and constitutionalism in everything, and indisposing them to submit to paternal and personal direction and suasion.

4. The titles and titular appendages which have become associated with the primatial dignity. These have rather a repellent effect on the native taste in such matters.—See Ross's Life of Bishop Ewing, p. 492.

It might be possible, by rigid Canonical restriction of the powers of the Primate, to remove, to a great extent, the objections to the *office*; but, in that case, the objections to the *title* would probably be strengthened.

The Primus says that, in writing to Mr Bowdler of Eltham,* he had mentioned this request of Mr Skinner's, "stating," he adds, "my reasons for not sanctioning the work of any man in my public capacity as a Bishop"; and that Mr Bowdler had agreed with him, thinking the request "inadmissible," and, "considering Mr Skinner's talents," wondering "that he should have made it."

* John Bowdler was one of a small knot of pious English laymen, including William Stevens, John Richardson, and James Allan Park, who, co-operating with about an equal number of zealous clergymen—Bishops Horsley and Horne, Dr Gaskin, and Messrs Boucher, and Jones of Nayland—helped greatly the little Scotch Church at a time when it stood sorely in need of help. Mr Bowdler, and his son after him, the Rev. Thomas Bowdler, gave liberally of his means to aid the more necessitous of the Scotch Clergy. Mr John Bowdler died in 1823, and a memoir of him was published in 1824. See Park's Life of Stevens for many interesting particulars of this band of excellent and zealous workers; most of whom (including apparently the whole Bowdler family) had a decided literary, as well as a theological turn.

CHAPTER IX.—1819-22.

Death of Bishop Macfarlane—Trustees of Episcopal Fund, &c., wish Mr Low to succeed him—Hesitation as to which Diocese, Fife or Ross, should elect—Mandate issued to Ross—Mr Low elected—Bishop Skinner protests against election—Primus publishes a charge—Bishop Skinner criticises it—Bishop Jolly defends it—Primus urges the Convocation of a General Synod—Bishop Skinner seconds—Bishop Low opposes him—Bishop Jolly "inflexible"—Visit of George IV. to Scotland—Excitement of Bishops.

NEXT year (1819) there was another Episcopal election, which illustrated even more strikingly than the Aberdeen election, the way in which such matters were managed in those days. Bishop Macfarlane, of Ross and Argyle, died at Inverness, July 26th. In former times, as an ardent Hutchinsonian, Bishop Macfarlane had occasionally, in his private letters, inveighed in unmeasured terms against Dr Gleig, who, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and other works, had borne rather hard upon "the Scotch Hutchinsonians."* But after Dr Gleig was raised to the Episcopate, the adverse feeling seemed to subside altogether, probably because the parties came mutually to know and respect each other.

* "The intolerance of the Scottish Hutchinsonians is the greatest objection that I have to them. They might, undisturbed by me, amuse themselves with their imaginary ethereal agents and their fanciful etymologies, if they would only permit me to say and think that the will of God is sufficient to account for all the phenomena, without the interposition of their fluids." Letter of Dr Gleig to Mr Boucher, 1802. (See Memoir of Joshua Watson, vol. i. 40.)

At Bishop Macfarlane's death, Ross and Argyle would at once have been re-united with Moray, had not Bishop Jolly, on account of his infirm state of health, declined the additional charge. Had he accepted the charge, a mandate would have been issued to Fife, and a Bishop appointed for that diocese.

Bishop Sandford resigned Fife as he had done in 1816, in order to provide a See for Mr Low, of Pittenweem. Circumstances, however, were changed; and the Primus was by no means so anxious for Mr Low's elevation now as he had been in 1816. There was still a coolness and a distance between him and Mr Low, consequent on the election proceedings of that year; and some influential Edinburgh laymen had on this occasion practically taken all management of the election out of the Bishops' hands. The Primus, therefore, would do nothing either to "oppose" or to "urge" Mr Low's election. He appeared also comparatively indifferent whether the mandate should be issued to Fife or to Ross, though he did not conceal his opinion that the Highland diocese had the prior claim. He left the matter to the three Northern Bishops, who decided for Ross. When the mandate was issued to Ross, it was doubtful who would be elected; and the Primus this time also entertained hopes that Bishop Torry would be elected, and thus the election of the sixth Bishop be deferred and simplified. He was very anxious that, if possible, an opening should be made for Mr Russell, of Leith, whom he "very much wished to see a Bishop." But Mr Russell "fought shy of the office," especially while Mr Low was in the way. The following extracts show the progress of the election proceedings, and the motives of the parties:—"You may remember," Mr Russell had written to the Primus about Sept. 1, 1819,

"that I constantly insisted upon one condition as preliminary to the most remote thought of becoming a Bishop, that Mr Low should previously have declined that office for Fife. . . I have every reason to conclude that he would accept; indeed, I am certain he would; and, moreover, that he would consider himself as having received the mitre from the gentlemen of the Episcopal Committee, under the direction, and with the concurrence of his present diocesan (Bishop Sandford.)"

Bishop Sandford had about the same time (August 28), written to the Primus—"I have been moved to the step of resigning my charge of Fife, chiefly by the expectation that Mr Low may be prevailed upon to become a Bishop, and by my conviction that, in the present case, his promotion will be of great advantage to our Church. But, unless my resignation is to be attended with this good consequence, I do not by any means desire to retire, &c."*

As already stated, the Bishops "did not accept of Bishop Sandford's resignation," but decided to issue a mandate to Ross and Argyll. Then the primus wrote thus to Bishop Torry (Sept. 29, 1819)—"I was favoured with your obliging letter of the 25th, and have only to unite my wishes with yours that any apprehensions of danger from what we have done may prove groundless. I had no wish for granting the mandate either to Ross in preference to Fife, or to Fife in preference to Ross. My only wish is that the new Bishop may be a well-informed man of conciliatory manners, and that his place of residence may be within a day's journey of Stirling or Edinburgh; and Bishop Sandford and I are determined not to concur in the consecration of any man situated at a greater distance from us. That determination I have signified to the

* Quoted in letter of Primus Gleig, September 4th, 1819.

Clergy of Ross and Argyle, stating for it our reasons, which are so obviously just, that I do not expect those Clergy, who seem not to be troublesome men, to make any opposition to them. My original plan, proposed to Bishop Jolly immediately after Bishop Macfarlane's death, was to unite Ross and Argyle . . . to Moray, and get a mandate issued immediately to the clergy of Fife. This measure I would have urged with all my might, had not John Forbes* prematurely proposed Mr Low for the new Bishop; but the moment that he was brought upon the carpet, I felt that I could not, with prudence or propriety, take a single step either to forward or retard that measure. . . . That he (Mr Low) would have been chosen by a majority of votes, I knew always to be probable, though very far from being certain. . . . Mr Low is not really acceptable to any one clergyman in Fife, but he is very acceptable to almost all the landed gentlemen, among whom he has lived for near thirty years as a pleasing visitor. . . . These men have interested in his favour the Trustees for the Episcopal Fund; and the whole body of laymen united have overpowered the clergy. . . . Were there nobody but the Trustees concerned in this manœuvre, I should not mind it much; but it is a combination of laymen to take all power out of the hands of Bishops, and place it in themselves."

Notwithstanding his decided disapproval of the irregular influences by which Mr Low's promotion was being pushed, and his own unsatisfactory relations with that gentleman,

* John Hay Forbes, son of Sir William Forbes, and afterwards Lord Medwyn—already referred to (p. 284-5). Another active supporter of Mr Low was Mr Forbes's brother-in-law, Mr Colin Mackenzie of Portmore (father of Bishop Mackenzie of the African Mission), who had a connexion with the Highland diocese. (See Blatch's Bishop Low, p. 50, *seq.*) These were leading "Gentlemen of the Episcopal Committee." Mr Mackenzie, indeed, and Sir W. Forbes, his father-in-law, were the chief originators of the Episcopal Fund. (Lawson, p. 366.)

the Primus seemed to think that it would be for the good of the Church that Mr Low should be permitted a chance of being elected both for Ross and Fife. "But if you (Bishop Torry) be elected, as I hope you shall, to the Highland diocese, what is to be done? Evidently this, either you will retain Dunkeld and Ross for a time till we see if Bishop Jolly can be persuaded to admit their (Ross and Argyle's) junction again with Moray; or, before we release you from your present charge, we will issue a mandate to Fife, and fill up the College before a mandate can be asked from any other quarter. This is the only thing which it appears to me that we can do, with any reasonable prospect of preserving peace in the Church," &c. No doubt, in this way the adjoining dioceses of Fife and Dunkeld might have been united then as they have been since; and there would have been a better distribution of Bishops and Bishoprics.

But it was not found necessary to have recourse to this mode of "filling up the College." Mr Low was elected Bishop by the clergy of Ross and Argyle, and so the Fife election scheme was dropt.

Mr Low's election was not very satisfactory in any way, except in its result. There were, it appears, only four electors at the meeting, and three candidates were proposed. There was thus, notwithstanding the powerful lay influence, about as little unanimity as possible. Still, Mr Low was elected; and no objection was made to the confirmation of his election by any of the Bishops except Bishop Skinner, who protested against it, on the ground of "undue lay interference."

There were, no doubt, as we have seen from the Primus's letters, pretty good grounds for this protest, especially as the Canons of those times did not permit

even the laity of a diocese a voice in the election of their Bishop. But from the influential position of the laymen concerned, and from the generally acknowledged fitness of the Bishop-elect, rejection in this case would have been a very serious matter indeed. The Primus could not have entertained the idea of rejection. Indeed, it is very doubtful if, after the experience of the Aberdeen election, the Bishops, as a body, would now, without the clearest case, have rejected the elect of even the smallest diocese. The time was past for such things. The vague unlimited discretionary power which the Canons allowed the Bishops in their corporate capacity was, in the changed condition of affairs, becoming a source of anxiety and trouble to the Bishops themselves—tending to embroil them with each other, and hinder cordial confidence and co-operation. It is easy to see from the Bishops' letters that it was a considerable time before the incidents of the last two elections were entirely forgotten by some of their number.

The Primus published another charge this year.* It was almost entirely doctrinal; and was probably intended partly as an indirect reply to some of the criticisms on his *Stackhouse*. After stating that all the different dispensations of religion "constituted but so many parts of one great and progressive scheme for the happiness and improvement of the human race," he proceeds to maintain "that the Church is now, and has long been, disturbed by useless, if not pernicious, controversies concerning

* "Observations on some of the Characteristic Doctrines of the Gospel: A Charge delivered in June 1819 to the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion of Brechin. By the Right Rev. George Gleig, LL.D., F.R.S.E., and F.S.S.A., their Bishop. Edinburgh: Bell & Bradfute, 1819." There is no record in the Minute Book of Brechin diocese of the Synod at which this charge was delivered, or of any Brechin Synod from 1814 to 1820. Blank pages, indicating omissions, form a sort of negative record. After 1820, almost every year has its minute of Synod; but none of the minutes have much interest till that of 1826.

original sin, regeneration, conversion, election, justification, and the *perseverance of the saints;* and until the disputants shall agree to trace the great progressive scheme of revelation from its commencement to its completion, it does not appear to me possible to put an end to these controversies. In most of them the same scriptural phrases are employed by all parties; but they are employed in senses so extremely different, that what may be true in one sense is not merely false but perhaps even impious in another."

He "gives an instance of this in the use of the word justification," maintaining that there is a distinction in Scripture, and "well known to the compilers of the Thirty-nine Articles," between a *first* and a *final* justification—the *first* by faith; the final by "good works, or faith which has wrought by love." This "distinction, however, if it is known by those who at present contend for justification by faith alone, is wholly overlooked by them."

In "the consequences of the first transgression" he maintains "will be found the key to all the mysteries that have been made about universal or partial *redemption, election, regeneration, conversion,* and *justification.*"*

Thus he comes round to his favourite dogma. And he not only held that the popular Calvinists of the day greatly exaggerated "the consequences of" the Fall, but he also thought that the IX. Article of "original or birth-sin" did not happily express those consequences. The phrase, "original or birth-sin," he thought neither Scriptural nor well chosen, since sin or guilt, in the proper sense of the word, the hereditary taint cannot be. "But although we cannot," he says, "be considered as *sharers* in the *guilt* of our first parents, our nature, as it is derived

* P. 14.

from them, may be so depraved by their fall as to render us much more prone than we should otherwise have been to the commission of actual sin; and this, I am persuaded, is a Scriptural truth of great importance if consistently expressed."*

He maintained that the IX. Article would have been expressed in a very different way had the compilers known the errors that have sprung up in the Church since their day—those of the Quakers, the modern Unitarians, and Evangelists. "The only errors which" the Reformers "appear to have had immediately in view were those of the Church of Rome and those of the Pelagians, which were then revived by the Anabaptists in Germany; and the Articles of our Church, in particular, were drawn up with a view to guard the members against the sophistry which might be employed in support of the errors of both these parties."

The Primus was not, however, entirely successful in convincing even friendly critics that his views on original sin were perfectly sound. Bishop Skinner wrote to Bishop Jolly, taking exception to the language of the charge on this subject. Bishop Jolly had read the charge, but had not "perceived in it anything obnoxious. On the contrary, when I hastily read it, I considered it a seasonable *caveat* against that species of Calvinism, which seems to spread, &c." But he saw clearly how the alleged extreme had arisen. "Endeavouring to make straight what is crooked, one is apt to bend the other way."† (Letter to Bishop Skinner, Feb. 7, 1820.)

The reader must have become convinced, if only from the incidents of the last two Episcopal elections, that the

* P. 20.

† See Antea, p. 308; also, Memoir of Bishop Jolly, p. 97.

Canons of 1811, however superior to the former Code, were still very defective. The Primus felt this strongly, and was very anxious that his colleagues should consent to the convocation of another General Synod for the revision of the Code. He, doubtless, hoped that, now that he had got another Southern colleague into the college, there would be no difficulty in bringing the Church Laws completely into harmony with the requirements of the times. But, if he did so, he was greatly mistaken. Bishop Low, though a very good Bishop, especially for a Highland diocese, had manifestly no great faith in Church Laws, and leant rather to the theory of personal government. He was opposed to the convocation of a Synod. So also was Bishop Jolly, whose word had great weight with the Primus. It must have been to the character, however, rather than to the arguments of Bishop Jolly that the Primus yielded. The arguments were, in fact, such as would hold good against any conceivable meeting of the Synod, being the risk of diversity of view, and disagreement as to the reform proposed, unsettlement of men's minds, &c.

The Primus appears to have renewed the proposal for a Synod every year, or every other year, for the next eight, endeavouring, if possible, to secure for it the assent of all his colleagues. It might, however, have soon been evident to him that there was one objection of Bishop Jolly's that no lapse of time would ever obviate. This was the fear, lest the next Synod would make further concessions to the Presbyters; and this, in the good man's view, meant farther encroachments on the Episcopal prerogative.

In writing to Bishop Torry (July 4th, 1821), the Primus says—"I really wish you would persuade our venerable and excellent brother at Fraserburgh to agree

to the holding of a Synod next year; for though I trust none of us shall be so infatuated as to agree to any explanation of the third Canon, *which might render us accountable for our conduct to the Presbyters*, there are other errors which certainly require explanation, and there are one or two Canons awanting. I have, therefore, directed my clergy to study the Canons with care, to mark each what he thinks should be altered in his own copy, &c., &c."

But Bishop Jolly continued "inflexible" in 1821 —as Bishop Low wrote Bishop Skinner, *he* also did— "in existing circumstances." And from delicate health, he was "morally certain that Bishop Sandford could not attend, even if the Synod were holden in the vestry of his own chapel." (Letter of Bishop Low, quoted by Bishop Skinner, Nov. 9th, 1821.)

The Primus was now on the verge of the three-score-and-ten; and notwithstanding his excellent constitution, he had become, in some respects, physically incapacitated for a due discharge of his duties as Primus. Writing to Bishop Skinner (March 4th, 1822), communicating a copy of a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, he says— "I will thank you to communicate this piece of information to our more northern brethren, to save me some writing, the mechanical part of which has always been to me a very irksome task, and daily becomes more irksome as I become older."

There can be little doubt that the growing mechanical difficulty in writing was one great cause of the complaint which begins to be heard about this time, that the Primus did not, in the transaction of Church affairs, sufficiently consult and concert with his colleagues. Doubtless he sometimes wrote only two or three letters, when strict duty might have required four or five. It was from his two

youngest colleagues, Bishops Skinner and Low, that this complaint of neglect was chiefly heard, and it is curious to observe the opposite effect which the alleged neglect produced upon them. Bishop Skinner it stimulated to plead with his colleagues to agree to more frequent meetings of the Bishops and Clergy, in order to secure general concert and co-operation in the transaction of Church business. In particular, he pleaded with Bishop Low to consent to the calling of a General Synod this year; and if possible, before the period of the King's arrival in Scotland, in order that full opportunity might be afforded for agreeing upon a general address to be presented to His Majesty. On Bishop Low the same cause seemed to produce an opposite effect. It confirmed him in his determination to maintain a policy of isolation. He not only refused to agree to the convocation of a General Synod, but he plainly declared that, if a Synod were called, he would not attend it; and if there should be any difficulty in getting up a general address to the King, he would, he said, present an address from himself and his diocese, and each of the other Bishops might do the same. To Bishop Skinner this policy appeared inconsistent and unseemly. "It seems strange that Bishop Low should be so properly sensible of the evils arising from our present mode of conducting the affairs of the Church, of which its *governors* are kept in such utter ignorance from the want of *universality* and *concert*, and yet should be so averse to the only mode of remedying the evil complained of, viz., by meeting together and acting in concert. What an unhappy effect it will have," he adds, "if the mode proposed by Bishop Low shall be adopted, in the event of a Royal visit, and each Bishop go up with a separate address! Where

were then the unity of the Church? The one heart and one mind," &c.

Bishop Low, however, was apparently in no mood to discuss those important Church questions in a calm and dispassionate spirit. But his opposition would have been of but little consequence had he not been still supported by Bishop Jolly. Of the attitude of the latter, the Primus wrote to Bishop Skinner (March 4, 1822)—"You cannot be more convinced than I am that, were the Bishops and clergy to meet in the unity of the spirit and in the bond of peace, much good might be done by a Synod; and I have stated my reasons for thinking so in as strong and clear terms as I could to Bishop Jolly; but he still continues *humbly* to think his own opinion better founded than Bishop Torry's and yours and mine; and I should as soon think of blowing my old *Alma Mater*, the King's College, to atoms by the breath of my mouth as of changing any opinion of his by *argument*."

The only chance that the Primus could see of bringing over Bishop Jolly was this, "If Mr Colin Mackenzie can persuade Sir William Forbes to signify to Bishop Jolly his approbation of such a measure," that is, of the holding of a General Synod. This proposal is made with an air of seriousness; but probably no more was meant by it than a suggestion that, in this matter of a General Synod, the good Bishop was more likely to be influenced by authority than by argument. It was hardly, however, to any modern authority that Bishop Jolly would have bowed in a matter of this sort.

The Synod was destined soon to be banished for a time from the Bishops' minds, by the approaching visit of King George IV. As that event drew near, it entirely absorbed their thoughts, throwing most of them into a

flutter of excitement. "The Primus," Dr Neale says, "seems to have been the only one who maintained his presence of mind on this exciting occasion." At one time there had been cause for apprehending some difficulty about the writing of the address to be presented to his Majesty. The Primus wrote to Bishop Torry (Sept. 1, 1821)—"Bishop Low, whose business it certainly is to write such addresses as we may have occasion to make to the King, informed me, on his return from Aberdeen, that you and Bishop Skinner and he were of opinion that I should continue to write such things, but that I should send them to all the Bishops for their correction before they be drawn up for their subscriptions! I can hardly suppose that any man at all in the habit of composition could *seriously* propose such an absurd measure as this. No address from such a body as we are should exceed six or eight sentences; all the Bishops have an equal right to correct the address; and all of them might be eager to display their critical talents! Each of them would, therefore, seize upon some sentence and alter it, or write it anew; and I leave you or any man to conceive what kind of a piebald address of six sentences would be written by six different men! Addresses should be written by some individual; and as it is unquestionably Bishop Low's duty to be our clerk, as the junior Bishop; I wish you would unite, and get Bishop Jolly to unite, with Bishop Sandford and me in appointing him to that office."

This was probably meant, chiefly as an energetic protest by the Primus against submitting to have his compositions overhauled by the "two junior colleagues," who, he seemed to think, did some things merely "for the pleasure of plaguing the Primus."

Anyhow, when the address to be presented at Holy-

rood came to be written, there was, as will be seen, no word of a clerk, though a caveat was certainly entered against revision.

The address, however—delicate matter as it certainly was, considering the Jacobitical antecedents of most of the Bishops—was by no means the matter that gave the Bishops most concern. It was rather the matter of outward personal decoration and behaviour at Court. The way in which they should be received at Court, and the dress in which they should appear—the wigs, and the buckles "on their shoes and at their knees," exercised them greatly.

The Southern Bishops were apprehensive lest their two elder Northern colleagues should not appear in presentable wigs. The Primus wrote to Bishop Torry on the subject (August 2nd, 1822). About Bishop Jolly's wig, he said—Bishop Sandford "seems absolutely nervous, alleging that the King will not be able to stand the sight of it, and assuring Dr Russell that it would convulse the whole Court." "But," he added—"What are you [Bishop Torry] to do about your own wig? which no wigmaker on earth could reduce to the most distant resemblance of an English Bishop's wig?" He then gives him excellent advice—"If your hair have any length at all, I would advise you to lay aside your wig when you go to Court, and to fill your own hair very full of powder, to prevent your catching cold."

Then as to the buckles—"You are probably aware that we must all appear before his Majesty with buckles on our shoes and at our knees, and that these buckles must be gold, or metal double gilt. At Court all clergymen wear yellow buckles, and laymen silver."

As to the composition of the address, the course taken

was this. The Primus first intimated his own intention to draw up a scroll address, and expressed a hope that each of his colleagues would do the same, and bring his copy to the preliminary meeting, that, "from the whole, a clean copy might be drawn up."

Some time after, he wrote that he had now drawn up a scroll of an address, which should be "submitted to the animadversions of his brethren;" but he hoped they "would either accept it entire, or reject it *in toto*," "for," he added, "a piece of patchwork, were Johnson, and Addison, and Gibbon the writers, would never do."

Here again, probably, the Primus meant no more than a warning against needless criticisms on the part of the juniors, and the production of such a patchwork composition as usually disfigures King's and Queen's speeches.

Anyhow, the question of the address was speedily and quietly settled. The Primus's copy was accepted, and apparently "entire." At least, it bears no marks of patchwork. On the contrary, it is clear, flowing, and elegant; and "it was," it is said, "much admired for its eloquence, moderation, and historical allusions."

The deputation that presented the address consisted of the six Bishops and six Presbyters, four of the latter belonging to Edinburgh. Bishop Skinner had wished that some "respectable laymen" should form part of the deputation, but to this the Primus objected, thinking that the deputation would be then too like "an American Convention."

CHAPTER X.—1822-1827.

Dean Torry's Reminiscences of the Bishop—Amongst his Books—On the Street—Visiting his Diocese—At the head of his table—Anecdotes—Dr Parr—Dean Hook, &c.—Contributes to "Scottish Episcopal Magazine"—Publishes Charge—Holds Visitation at St Paul's, Dundee—Sprains his knee-joint—Visits his Son "in his own parish" in Kent—Death of Mrs Gleig—Again urges the calling of a General Synod—Mr Skinner of Forfar's Circular—The Luscombe Case—Inherent difficulties of case—College divided—Deed of Election unattainable—Substitute procured too late to ensure unanimity—Consecration of Dr Luscombe—Dissent of Bishops Torry and Skinner—Bishop Low refuses to record their reasons of dissent.

As yet we have seen little of Dr Gleig save in his public and official character. We are now, however, come well within the range of living memories, and can happily enjoy a glimpse into his home life and family circle. The present venerable Dean of St Andrews, the Very Rev. John Torry, lived in the neighbourhood of Stirling for two years (1819-20), and, during that time, saw very much of the Bishop. Indeed, he says, "For two years 'I sat at his feet,' and obtained from him my early instruction in theology." He was often in the Bishop's house and at his table, and was invariably received by him with the utmost kindness. He learnt much, both directly and indirectly, from this close intercourse; and he speaks in very emphatic terms of the Bishop's deep learning and powerful memory, and of the ready wit and humour with which his conversation sparkled. But here are a few of his graphic pen and ink sketches of the Bishop *at home*.*

* These sketches were obligingly written by the Dean for this Memoir.

"The Bishop was very jealous of any one interfering with the books in his library, which was a very extensive one.* Often when I went to call on him I had the privilege of being admitted into his sanctuary. I have, in my mind's eye, the picture of the great man sitting, not at a large and commodious desk, such as is to be seen in modern days, provided with all the easy appliances for consultation of authors, but at a small table-desk, about 2 feet by 3 feet in dimensions, standing near the middle of the room, writing out of his capacious head (for he had a very large head, with a fine forehead, conspicuous for the bump of causality). Whenever he had occasion to consult an authority, he knew exactly where to find it; would go to the shelf where it rested, take it down, and, before opening the book, give a good blow with his mouth to take off the dust; then lay it on his desk, and having made the necessary extract, carefully replace the volume. He was very chary of any one interfering with his books in the way of dusting or cleaning them; so that no one dared to touch them while he was at home; but when he had occasion to be absent for a considerable time, the ladies took advantage of his absence to effect a thorough cleansing and tidying of the sanctum.

After he became a Bishop, he was very particular about his costume. He always wore a short cassock,† with knee-breeches and buckles and silk stockings; and when he

* Bishop Gleig's fondness for book-buying did not amount to *disease*, as Bishop Jolly says his did. The latter, says Dr Hill Burton, "had one failing to link his life with this nether world—a failing that leaned to virtue's side; he was a book hunter."—Book Hunter, p. 221.

† Bishop Gleig's "apron," like Bishop Jolly's wig, appears to have sometimes drawn upon itself the unaccustomed eyes of the street boys in the northern towns of his diocese, where a Bishop was seldom seen, in a way that was rather embarrassing to the wearer. A clergyman, once of the Bishop's diocese, remembers an instance of the juvenile crowding and staring; but says that the Bishop was amused rather than offended by it, and passed on with a humorous remark and gesture.

had occasion to go out in the town to pay a visit, either pastoral or friendly, it was a pleasant picture to see the trim old gentleman, pacing along the street, with his shovel hat and gold-headed staff.

How different the garb in which I have seen him arrayed, when he was preparing to start on his triennial visit through his diocese! It consisted, besides a good travelling coat, of a pair of grey cloth breeches, and a pair of old rusty top-boots, with very brown leather on the upper part. And his mode of conveyance was (similar to that used by my father), a horse and gig, hired for the continuous journey, and accompanied by his son or some other friend to take care of him.

Often have I dined at the Bishop's hospitable board, and it was a treat to see how, after labouring in his study all day, he enjoyed his dinner. A constant accompaniment of the meal was some London porter, which was drunk out of a large silver cup, that went round the family circle, and when it came to the Bishop himself, he lifted it up with both his hands, and took "a long and a strong pull." Occasionally, also, he indulged in a *tiny dram*, generally quoting the authority of his friend, Professor Thomson, of Glasgow, the celebrated chemist of his day, as to the great value of the dram at dinner, the alcohol being "a solvent of fat," and therefore an aid to digestion. I am not sure that the theory was true, but it served the good man's purpose, as it often has that of others, the late Dr Norman Macleod, for instance."*

* It is said that Dr Norman Macleod happened to dine with some ladies soon after he had had the honour to dine with the Queen at Balmoral, and his hostesses pressed him hard to repeat to them some part of her Majesty's conversation with him. Norman was too well bred to remember anything. However, being pressed again just after the salmon, he said—By the bye, I do remember *one* thing. At this stage of the dinner, Her Majesty said, "Norman, wont you take a dram; it's an excellent thing after salmon."

The Bishop wrote a very illegible hand. At a little distance his manuscript looks as if written in Greek, rather than in Roman characters. *Apropos* of this, the Dean tells the following story. "His neighbour, Mr Sheriff, the minister (in 1819) of St Ninians, (close to Stirling), who was a scholar like himself, had a correspondence with the Bishop, in which the latter had, on one occasion, to make some quotation in Greek. The first time they met afterwards, Mr Sheriff said to him, "Well, Bishop, I got your letter, and I could read your Greek, but your *English* fairly baffled me."

The famous Dr Parr visited Stirling in 1819; and Mr Torry saw him in the Bishop's church, and met him afterwards in the Bishop's house. Mr Torry was not a little impressed with the great Doctor's conversational powers; but what struck him most of all was his behaviour in church during the delivery of the sermon. The Doctor sat in front of the pulpit, and paid the closest attention to the sermon; but he did not confine himself to silent marks of respect and approval. Whenever the Bishop said anything that particularly pleased him, he exclaimed* quite audibly, "Good!" "That's very good!" "Capital!"

So far as appears, the Bishop's contributions to literature for some years about this time (1820-23) were limited to an occasional article or review in the columns of his friend Dr Russell's Church organ, *The Scottish Episcopal Magazine*. The chief of these articles are to be found in Vol. II. (1821), and comprise "A Historical Outline of

* Dr Parr was at the time pretty well advanced in years, having been born in 1747, and it is probable that he made such remarks as the above in a fit of absence. The late Dean Hook, of Chichester, is said to have been accustomed, for a few years before his death, to give like audible expression to his sentiments during the service in his cathedral. When the officiating clergyman said, "Here endeth the first lesson," the Dean would sometimes add, "And a very good lesson it is." And if the sermon did not please him, he occasionally muttered, "What stuff!" &c.

the Episcopal Church of Scotland," in three instalments (pp. 20, 177, 342); a review of Dr Brown's "Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind," in two instalments (pp. 407, 506); and a review of Copleston on "Necessity and Predestination," (p. 586).

All these articles, and others in Vol. III., are attested by the initials "G. G.," or "G. G., Stirling," with the exception of the "Historical Outline."

At this period (1822-3) we find in his letters and publications many traces of the Bishop's activity in all the spheres of duty; not a few of them highly characteristic, both of the man and of the time. He visited his diocese in July 1822, and delivered a charge, which was published;* and in November he was called to Dundee to investigate a case of discipline.

The subject of the charge was the two mysterious doctrines on which the controversies of the day had chiefly hinged—the doctrine of the Trinity and that of original sin. On the Trinity, the Primus's views were entirely those of the Church; and all that he aimed at was to make the relation between the three persons more level to our conceptions by such analogies as that of the sun with its light and heat—"Light of light, heat of heat."

On the subject of original sin, his views continued substantially unchanged; but he expressed them in terms which harmonised better with the language of the articles. "Human nature suffered some deterioration in consequence of Adam's fall." "Unlike all his descendants, Adam felt *no bias* in his mind to evil." "Every one of *them* hath been more or less *biassed to evil*." "As we both admit the *depravity of mankind in consequence of*

* Observations on some prevalent Modes of contending for the Faith once delivered to the Saints: A Charge, &c. Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1822.

the fall of Adam, we both admit all which the article requires of us."

"That the Church doth not expect us all to form the very same conception of the *nature* of this depravity, or of the *manner* in which it is derived to us from Adam, is evident from her giving four different translations of the same Greek words* by which it is supposed to be expressed, without preferring any one of them to the others."

Very probably the chief reason why the Bishop selected these two most mysterious subjects on this occasion was that he had, during the summer, had rather a sharp encounter with an old antagonist in the pages of the *Episcopal Magazine* on the subject of original sin. The tone of the charge, however, was by no means aggressive or dogmatic; but the reverse—tolerant and conciliatory —the tone of a man who has had much experience of the utter fruitlessness of controversy on such subjects by churchmen amongst themselves, and who sees that the only way to peace and union is to let each churchman explain *the mode* of the mystery to himself.

The only interest the Dundee case has for readers of the present day lies in its incidental illustration of the state of the times. The preliminary investigation of it, which was conducted with the assistance of Bishop Skinner and some Presbyters, convinced the Primus of the great deficiencies of the then "very imperfect Code" of Canons, and the difficulty of trying such a case under them. But the incident most characteristic of the times is the fact which the Bishop, after investigation, repeatedly affirms, viz., that the case was, in reality, a product of the fervid political excitement of the times. The clergyman of St Paul's, Dundee, had written "a very improper

* Φρόνημα Σαρκὸς. See Article IX.

letter" to a young person of his congregation. Nothing was heard of the letter for two years and four months, and the Bishop declared that "no real injury would have been done to any one by the foolish letter, which never would have been heard of, if the layman had not brought forward his charge in revenge for the clergyman's refusing to keep his pulpit and desk in mourning for the late Queen of *precious* memory." The case caused intense excitement in the congregation and some secessions; but by the fair and judicious management of the Bishop, the result, on the whole, was a comparatively quiet and peaceful settlement. The offender escaped with a "severe reproof."

In the spring of 1823 the Bishop met with a rather serious accident, of which, and the consequences of it to him and his congregation, he gives the following account in a letter to Bishop Torry (March 3rd, 1823).

"The accident was indeed an ugly one, being a very bad sprain of the joint of my right kneé, and the second that I have had of that joint. It was occasioned by missing two steps at the bottom of a stair, and falling with great violence, and was apparently as bad a sprain as the surgeon, a man of much experience, says he ever saw; but after being confined four weeks to my room, and mostly to my sofa, I am now getting rapidly better. The chapel was shut for three successive Sundays, and likewise on Ash Wednesday, for my neighbour, Mr Cruickshank, at Muthill,* has long ago laid down for himself a rule never to givé nor receive assistance; and Mr Walker (Kirk-

* Muthill, near Crieff, Perthshire, is not so far from Stirling (about 16 miles) as to make it difficult for a clergyman to have morning service at the one place, and evening service at the other, on the same day. But Mr Cruickshank was rather old to "*give* assistance" in this way. It was now 34 years since he had had his gown returned to him by Gask, in token of dismissal, for having "begun nominal prayers" for King George. (See Bishop Jolly, p. 42.)

aldy?), being unable to do his own duty, none of my Edinburgh friends could be spared from their own charges. On the second Sunday in Lent, I did the whole *forenoon* duty of the chapel *sitting in the desk.*"

In those days the difficulty of supplying the place of a sick or absent clergyman was much greater than it is even now. The charges were few and far apart, and the only course in general was to "shut up the chapel."

The Bishop's chapel was shut up again for two Sundays during the summer. He went to England in the month of June, having some Church and family business to arrange, and "a strong desire to visit his son in his own parish;" and he was detained longer than he expected to be. While in England, he did what he could to forward a measure for securing the Regium Donum for the Church.* "I have seen the Archbishop thrice," he wrote Bishop Torry (August 19, 1823), "and was advised by his Grace to concert with Mr Colin Mackenzie,† a measure for bringing us and our merits before Parliament next Session. The outlines of what he suggested I shall certainly lay before my colleagues as soon as I have had an opportunity of considering them with Mr Mackenzie, to whom, and to whom alone, I was desired to communicate them in the first place; but I did not so much as land at Newhaven on my return from England, not having arrived in the roads till Saturday morning, and my chapel having been shut two Sundays by my having been detained in Kent a week longer than I expected to be."

* The Regium Donum (£1200) appears to have been granted for the first time in 1814, (See Chap. vii.). It had been discontinued for several years, and this attempt to obtain the renewal of it did not succeed till 1828. From that time, the grant was continued pretty regularly, but only every *second* year, till 1856, when it was finally withdrawn. It was, to some extent, replaced by a Compensation Fund, raised within the Church.

† See Antea, p. 318.

The Bishop suffered a good deal in his passage from London, on account of the beds in the steamer being "so narrow, that he could not turn himself in them." He had not yet recovered from the effects of his sprain, and to remain long in one position was very trying to him.

The year 1824 was another year of bereavement and sorrow to the Bishop. Mrs Gleig, who, as appears from the Bishop's letters, had been in a declining state for some time, died on the 15th of June. The loss was keenly felt by the Bishop, and for a time he was unable to devote himself to Church business with his usual energy and assiduity.

This was the year of the Triennial General Meeting of the Friendly Society at Aberdeen, and the Primus, expecting to meet the majority of his colleagues on that occasion, had resolved to make another attempt to persuade them to consent to the convocation of a General Synod. It was the more desirable that he should take advantage of this opportunity, that the chances of the Synod had been somewhat damaged of late by over zealous advocacy. The Rev. John Skinner, Forfar, who had always been an earnest advocate of regular periodical Synods of all sorts, and of the general supremacy of law in the Church,* had this year issued a circular letter on the subject. In that famous document—which is still seasonable—Mr Skinner advocated not only the calling of a General Synod, but the enactment of a Canon making the meeting of Synods no longer dependent on the will of the Bishops, nor yet composed solely of the representatives of the clergy. In short, he recommended the adoption of a constitution similar to that of the American Church, of

* See his letter to his father (Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, p. 494), and one to Bishop Torry (Neale's Torry, pp. 98-99.)

the advantages of which, in promoting a general and active interest in Church matters, he had been convinced by Bishop Hobart, when that distinguished Prelate lately visited Scotland.

The effect of this circular on the opponents of a Synod was to intensify their opposition. The chief reason why Mr Skinner desired a Synod, was the chief reason why the most influential of them dreaded it. He wanted more law, and less arbitrary will; and he made light of the argument from primitive precedent against imposing restrictions on Episcopal power.*

None of the Bishops were prepared for the more advanced suggestions of the circular. "Extravagant" or "absurd innovations" were the mildest epithets applied to them by any of their number; and those who had still a word to say for the Synod, felt it necessary to begin with an earnest disclaimer of sympathy with the circular. It was thus that the Primus wrote to Bishop Torry (July 5, 1824), on the subject of the Synod and the circular, when he found that he could not attend the meeting in Aberdeen. "I certainly expected to be with you at the ensuing meeting of the Friendly Society, and I even expected that the change of scene might tend to elevate my spirits, which I confess are very low. The death of Mrs Gleig, however, has made such a change . . . that I find I cannot get away." "I must, therefore, request you to read to our colleagues, but to them only, or at most, to them and the Deans, an address which I

* "The duty of the Bishop ought in all things to be prescribed by Canon. . . . The independence of the Bishops in the primitive ages constitutes no solid objection to the enactment of such a law, any more than the natural independence of man constitutes a valid objection to his dutiful submission to the laws of his country; the general good of society demands the one, the harmony and general good of the Church demands the other."—See Grub, vol. iv., pp. 276-7.

had intended to read myself, could I have been present, and to carry it with you for good Bishop Jolly's perusal, if he be not present at Aberdeen. If it do not convince him of the necessity of occasional Synods, as well as of the absurdity of the innovations proposed in the circular, I shall certainly be much surprised; but I shall as certainly make no farther efforts to procure what I think so necessary to the prosperity of our Church, as I am conscious of having done my duty, and done all that duty requires of me."

In the last month of 1824, and the first three months of 1825, the Primus was much occupied, and not a little distracted by another case of consecration to the Episcopate—that of Dr Luscombe, as Quasi-Missionary Bishop of the Anglican Congregations in France and the adjacent countries. From the inherent difficulties of this case, the Bishops were a good deal divided regarding it, the two "junior colleagues," Bishops Low and Skinner, taking a prominent stand on opposite sides. The great difficulty of the case was this, that Dr Luscombe had no title or claim to jurisdiction. He was not elected to office by the clergy over whom he was to preside, as required by the Scotch Canons, nor was he appointed by any other recognised authority.

When told by the Primus* that it would be necessary to procure a deed of election by the clergy, and also to prevent international complications, submit the scheme to the heads of the English Church and State, he maintained that to attempt to do either of these things would be to risk the entire miscarriage of the scheme. It would

* Great part of the correspondence on the subject, including letters to the Primus from the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop Van Mildert, and Mr (afterwards Sir Robert) Peel, will be found in Neale's Torry, pp. 118-138. The quotations in the text are from unpublished letters.

be sure, through some channel or other, to become known to the general public, and then such opponents as the French Roman Catholics would raise insuperable obstacles to its accomplishment. The Primus, however, wrote to the Archbishop, who advised him "to do nothing in this matter without previously consulting some of His Majesty's Ministers." The Primus, therefore, did consult Mr Peel, and Dr Luscombe himself consulted Mr Peel and Mr Canning, with no bad result whatever, but the reverse, Mr Canning offering him an introduction to the British Ambassador at Paris.

Bishop Low, however, who was the first of the Bishops to whom Dr Luscombe applied, and who had been all along his ardent supporter, thought this "reference to Her Majesty's Government, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury," "most unwarrantable;" but none of his colleagues appear to have agreed with him in this.

There remained now only the deed of election difficulty. Dr Luscombe contended that his case was too exceptional —too much that of a mere *Missionary* Bishop, to require compliance with such "forms" as a deed of election. Bishop Low agreed with him, and in arguing with his colleagues, pointed with scorn to the "lax" practice of other Churches, and of their own in quite recent times.*

* "I know of no Church existing which has uniformly made *election* a *sine quâ non* for consecration. There is no election in Ireland; there is none in the British Colonies; and there is none in England; for, setting aside the pressure of the Royal Congé d'élire, I maintain that to be a farce —a mere mockery—which is performed by a Dean and a dozen or so of drones of Prebendaries or Canons . . . . though the diocese may contain a thousand clergymen!! Our own Church has been as lax—having been for a considerable time governed by a series of Bishops who were never elected or appointed to any particular district. Your own father [Bishop John Skinner] was consecrated without an election, so was Bishop Macfarlane, so was Bishop Strachan, and so was the present Bishop of Moray; and Bishop Macfarlane's election, when it did take place, was made by one solitary presbyter; and Bishop Rose, I believe, never presided over more than one presbyter all his life." (Letter of

At last, however, Dr Luscombe made an effort to comply with the requirement of the Canon; but he soon came to the conclusion that compliance was practically impossible, and that to insist on it was really to refuse consecration. In this conclusion, the three Southern Bishops and Bishop Jolly acquiesced, the latter with great reluctance, but yet in very decided terms. It seems strange that the deed of election should have been so much insisted on as it was; for a deed from a body of presbyters so anomalously circumstanced as the Continental chaplains were, would have been a mere form. The nearest possible approach to a real compliance with the Canon would have been a promise from some of the Continental clergy to recognise Dr Luscombe in his Episcopal character, and apply to him for Episcopal functions. With a promise of this nature, or an expression of "concurrence"* in the consecration, even the two outstanding Northern Bishops would, in the end, have been contented. Dr Luscombe set himself to procure some such promise, and succeeded; but, unfortunately, not in time to be able to communicate the result to the Northern Bishops before the consecration. He "produced," the Primus said, "letters promising all due obedience from three clergymen, one in Paris, one at Caen, and the third at Ostend."

It is evident from the letters of both Prelates that, had

Bishop Low to Bishop Skinner, Aug. 30, 1825.) The Bishop might have added to this list that Bishop Petrie was elected to two dioceses by one presbyter.—See Grub IV., p. 89. In regard to the election of Bishop Strachan, it appears from the Minute Book of Brechin, that, when Dr Abernethy Drummond was elected by the Brechin clergy, he requested them (on account of his residence being so distant from the diocese), to allow Mr Strachan, of Dundee, to be consecrated as coadjutor to him; and that the clergy readily complied with the request.

* The said Bishops . . . dissent from the mode of Dr Luscombe's consecration without some previous deed of election, or, at least, of concurrence on the part of some of the clergy at any rate, &c."—Reasons of Dissent by Bishops Skinner and Torry.

Bishops Skinner and Torry been present on the occasion of the consecration, and seen these letters, they would have withdrawn all opposition.

It seems all the more unfortunate, therefore, that the Primus did not see his way to comply with a request for further delay. Bishop Skinner wrote him (Feb. 21, 1825) that he could not attend the consecration on the 5th Sunday in Lent, and that he and Bishop Torry "would crave permission to have their reasons of dissent recorded in the minutes of the transaction," if the consecration should be performed then without a deed of election, or any equivalent for a deed. He added, "Could Dr Luscombe be even yet prevailed upon to obtain the wished-for suffrage from a few of the Continental clergy, and *if you will consent*, in order to give time for obtaining this, *to postpone the consecration* until some convenient Sunday *after* Easter, I am persuaded both Bishop Torry and myself would make a point of attending, &c."

Thus it is plain that a further delay of three weeks would, in all probability, have united all the six Bishops, "heart and hand," in the work of consecration.

The Primus, however, had already postponed the consecration for six weeks; and had made all his arrangements for its performance on Palm Sunday, March 26th. On that day, therefore, it took place in his church at Stirling, the three Southern Bishops being the consecrators. Bishop Jolly was unable to attend, but expressed a strong wish to be present, that "his hand as well as his heart might be in the work."

The consecration sermon was preached by the Rev. W. F. Hook, afterwards the well-known "greatest parish priest" of England.

The consecration did not, by any means, put an end to

the disputes among the Bishops regarding the case. The two dissentients adhered to their dissent, regarding the fact that an equivalent had at the last moment been produced for the deed of election as only another proof that the case had been unduly hurried on. It was Bishop Skinner who forwarded his own and Bishop Torry's reasons of dissent to Bishop Low, requesting him (April 16th), as clerk of the college, to enter them in the minute. Bishop Low replied (April 30), "I was favoured with your letter enclosing your own and Bishop Torry's protest, which has not [been], and never shall be, inserted by me in our register, out of sheer compassion to the two Right Reverend Protesters." He then proceeded to discuss, in the style already indicated, "the reasons of dissent;" but the time for discussion was past, and the dissentients insisted on compliance. As clerk of the college, Bishop Low, they maintained, had no discretion in the matter; he must do as he was bid. But such strict compliance with rule and form seemed little to the mind of the Bishop of Ross. His Northern colleagues were struck with his "assumption of power." "He complains," Bishop Skinner wrote, "of the Primus's assumption of power, but it is a mere bagatelle to that of the clerk!"*

* Of course, Bishop Low had to yield in the end, being unsupported by the other two consecrators, but he did so with a bad grace. At first, from the want of law or precedent in the matter, Bishop Skinner had rather apprehended an authoritative refusal to minute the reasons of dissent. The following extract from a letter of his to Bishop Torry (March 7th, 1825) is interesting for more reasons than one. "Upon looking into the very scanty minutes of our Episcopal Synods, I scarce find any precedent of such dissent being recorded, not even in the instance of Bishop Jolly's consecration. In that of Bishop Kilgour, in Sept. 1768, a protest by Bishop Forbes, and very considerable opposition are mentioned; and what seems very strange, and was hitherto unknown to me, *Bishop Kilgour was consecrated by only two Bishops*—Bishops Raitt and Alexander." Our Church historians all give *three*, as the number of Bishop Kilgour's consecrators; but, doubtless, the register is right. Bishop Forbes had himself been elected by the clergy of Aberdeen, but the college had refused to confirm his election. Hence the division in the college, and the difficulty in finding the due number of consecrators.

It must thus be seen that, though the Primus, no doubt, made some mistakes in the management of this delicate and anomalous case, he had great difficulties to contend with. He had to withstand pressure from both sides. And, after all, the mistakes were of no serious consequence—certainly not such as to affect in any way the successful working of the scheme.

Bishop Luscombe, by his own acknowledgment, found from the first a most promising field of labour in France. *Jurisdiction*, indeed, he could not have; but his Episcopal character was recognised by the British residents of all ranks, from the Ambassador downwards. In general, his Episcopal offices were thankfully accepted. He obtained a recognised position in connection with the English Church, by being appointed Commissary of the Bishop of London, "for the performance of confirmations on the Continent, for receiving stated reports from the clergy, and some other official duties."

The least satisfactory result of the Luscombe case was its effect on the Episcopal College itself. It aggravated considerably the unpleasant feeling that subsisted between the Primus and the two junior members, and still more that between the two juniors themselves. The Primus complained that Bishops Skinner and Low had blamed him unreasonably for his conduct in different parts of the transaction, and sought on this, as on former occasions, to circumscribe unduly his powers as Primus—denying him all initiative and discretion, even in "matters of taste," and reducing his position practically to that of "clerk or amanuensis of the college." Bishop Skinner had found fault with the wording of all the addresses which he had written, with the exception of the last, "which he probably supposed had been composed by Bishop Sand-

ford," and continued to insist that these addresses ought to be submitted to all the Bishops for their revision and correction, before being circulated for signature. But the Primus argued, if he was not fit to write a few sentences of an address to Royalty, he was not fit for the office—and Bishop Skinner's father would never have submitted to have *his* addresses revised by the Bishops all round. Unless a better understanding could be come to as to the duties of the office of Primus, "no consideration on earth" would induce him to hold it "longer than Whit Sunday."

The senior Bishops deprecated strongly the proposed resignation. Bishop Torry wrote the Primus, "We cannot do without you." Bishop Jolly "earnestly protested against" resignation, and told the Primus "it would be dereliction of his duty." We are not told, but we cannot doubt what was Bishop Sandford's view of the matter, as he invariably co-operated with the Primus. Certainly, the seniors showed more consideration for the Primus than the juniors.

There was, however, a very marked difference in the grounds of the opposition of the two juniors. Bishop Low seemed to be guided a good deal by impulse, Bishop Skinner generally by a very strict, if not exaggerated, regard for rule and order. Bishop Low says in one of his letters that the Primus accused him of acting from "petulance" or "pique," and he certainly sometimes, as in the matter of a General Synod, refused to do what he acknowledged to be right, only, as it appeared, because, in his opinion, some other things had not been done right. Bishop Skinner's opposition was far more reasonable, and, in fact, was at worst only the excess of a virtue. He was a most careful and regular business man, and only asked of his colleagues what he himself was always ready to grant.

The threat of resignation was not carried out by the Primus, probably on account of the remonstrances of the senior Bishops, and the probability that the matter in dispute would soon receive an authoritative settlement by a General Synod.

During the year 1826 the Church was greatly agitated by the outbreak of a controversy, which was new in the North. Native Episcopalians had as yet but faintly realised the extent to which English Church parties differed from each other, and the unmeasured terms in which they denounced each other's teaching. Hence, when the Rev. Edward Craig, an English Evangelical, who had lately settled in Edinburgh,* attacking a publication of Dr (afterwards Bishop) Walker's, asserted that Scotch Episcopalians "were perishing for lack of knowledge"—that "they had looked for the bread of life in the pulpit ministrations of their own Church, and had not found it, &c., &c., they were needlessly excited, and called for "judicial measures." The Bishop of Edinburgh, however, after consulting with his leading clergy, who were mostly English, like himself, decided that the wisest course would be to take no "official notice" of the attack. The Primus had intended—and, in fact, had already begun—to draw up a pastoral letter on the subject; but on learning the decision of the Edinburgh clergy, he abandoned his intention.

At the instance of two of his colleagues, however, he called a meeting of the Episcopal Synod, to consider the question, in the month of August, when the Bishops had occasion to be in Edinburgh on the business of the Pantonian Funds. The Synod met (August 9th, 1826); but though it received a strong declaration condemnatory of Mr Craig from upwards of thirty of the presbyters and

* See Bishop Jolly, pp. 106-7.

deacons, it came to the same determination as the Edinburgh clergy, and nothing official was done.*

The Primus was not present at the Episcopal Synod, but gave his vote by proxy, as did also Bishop Jolly.

* The Bishops sympathised with Dr Walker, but it was not a case for authoritative censure. The time was past when they could with safety refuse to tolerate anything that was tolerated in the English Church. It appears, however, that the Primus was himself in favour of summary action.

In a letter addressed to the Clergy of Brechin, and read at their "annual meeting," he said—"It is my decided opinion that he (Rev. E. Craig) should be expelled from our communion, for it is safer to deal with an open enemy, than with a treacherous friend; but as he who has a right to call him to account (Bishop Sandford) thinks otherwise, and perhaps thinks more correctly, &c.", nothing would be done by the Church as a body. The Bishop would simply act for himself, and his own diocese. He therefore *desired* (did not *command*), his Clergy to have no communion or communication with Mr Craig. "I desire you never to admit into your desks or pulpits the Rev. Edward Craig, of St Edmund's Hall, Oxford, known at present as minister of St James's Chapel, Broughton Place, Edinburgh; and when you may have occasion to be in Edinburgh yourselves, you will never go to that chapel to worship God in public, so long as he shall be the minister of it, unless he retract his calumnies of our clergy, and of the doctrines which they preach, as publicly as he has circulated, and continues to circulate them." This amounted to an excommunication of Mr Craig within the diocese of Brechin, and the Clergy were quite prepared to give effect to it. A series of seven Resolutions, in which they pledged themselves to "attend to his exhortations," were moved in Synod by Mr Horsley, and "unanimously approved of." Resolution 4 ran as follows:—"That the said Presbyters, with all becoming humility and respect, request their diocesan to accept of their sincere thanks for his most excellent pastoral letter, and to assure him that they are duly sensible of the vigilant attention manifested by him, on this and all occasions, to the interests of the Church in general, and to the congregations committed to his spiritual oversight in particular."

CHAPTER XI.—1827-1830.

Publishes a Work on the Study of Theology—Nature of the Work—Review of it by the "British Critic"—Summons a General Synod—Synod makes some important enactments—Quinquennial General Synod and "Barrier" Provisions—Summons a Second General Synod in 1829—Synod of '29 undoes work of Synod of '28—Publishes a Charge giving view of Constitution of Church.

In the spring of 1827, the Primus published a volume of 465 pages 8vo., entitled "Directions for the Study of Theology, in a series of Letters from a Bishop to his son on his admission to Holy Orders."*

As the author states in his preface, a good deal of the matter of this volume had already appeared in various miscellaneous publications to which he had contributed; and three dissertations in the Appendix, including one on Original Sin, are taken, with little alteration, from his edition of *Stackhouse*.

Ecclesiastically, times are very greatly changed since the publication of this work; and it is instructive to

* Prefixed to the work were the following two quotations, which form very appropriate mottoes, not only to this volume, but to every work, in which the Bishop sought to expound the ways of God to man, especially in the punishment of sin, whether original or actual:—

"In all your sermons and discourses, speak nothing of God but what is honourable and glorious; and impute not to him such things, the consequents of which a wise and good man will not own."—Jeremy Taylor.

Θεὸς οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς ἄδικος ἀλλ' ὡς οἷόν τε δικαιότατος, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀυτῳ ὁμοιότερον οὐδὲν ἢ ὃς ἂν ἡμῶν ἂυ γέννηται ὅτι δικαιότατος.

Plato.

compare it with works of a similar class issued at the present day. It came out entirely as an English book; the date (Stirling, Feb. 1, 1827) being perhaps the sole indication of its Scotch origin. The author doubtless looked chiefly to England as the field of circulation for such a work. His son, to whom the letters were addressed, had been a candidate for English orders, and was now an English clergyman. The letters were supposed to be first *read* in England, and, as Bishop Skinner observed in a letter of the period, "the 'Church' referred to in the letters is not the author's Church, but his son's Church."

As a whole, the work represents very faithfully the doctrines of the English Church, the only exception being the explanation of original sin, which, as has been seen, does not quite agree with the natural interpretation of the Articles. On all other leading subjects—Baptism, the Holy Eucharist, Justification, &c.—he states fairly and impartially the views and arguments of the different schools and parties; usually, however, summing up in favour of the teaching of the Moderate High Church School, which formed then, as it probably does now, the great central body of English Churchmen.

Of Article XVII. he says, "Our article on predestination is perhaps as perspicuously and cautiously expressed as it was possible that any opinions could be expressed on so abstruse a subject; but I cannot help regretting that it should have ever been deemed expedient to introduce the subject into the public creed of any Church" (p. 274).

On the subject of the Eucharist, after stating the arguments and authorities for three views—1. That the Eucharist is a commemorative sacrifice; 2. That it is a

mere memorial of our Lord's passion; 3. That it is a feast upon a sacrifice—he concludes, "Of these three views of the nature and end of the Lord's Supper, which I believe to be the only views that are taken of that ordinance by divines of any eminence in the Church of England, I perceive little or no essential difference between the first and third; though I certainly should prefer calling the *Eucharist*, or *Lord's Supper*, a *feast on the sacrifice* rather than *a sacrifice* itself" (p. 317).

On the subject of the Atonement, the Bishop confesses that his views had undergone a change in the direction of orthodoxy. "It is evident," he says (p. 220), "that he (Bishop Warburton) considered our redemption from the death incurred by the fall of our first parents as the sole purpose for which a Redeemer was expressly promised to the apostate pair, and for which, in the fulness of time, he died on a cross. This, I confess, was for many years my own opinion; but now I think differently, and am convinced that Christ gave his life a sacrifice as *directly* for the actual sins of men as for the original guilt of our first parents."

On the subject of Justification, he maintained, as he had always done,* that there is, properly speaking, a *first* and a *final* justification— one on admission to the Church, and one at the last day.

How far the work expressed the views of the English High Church party of the period may be seen from the review of it in the *British Critic*, the then organ of that party.† The review was very favourable, yet discriminating. The writer of it differed from the Bishop as to the possibility of such a thing as Natural Religion

* See the notice of his charge of 1819.

† Vol. I., new series, 1827.

having ever been "professed or practised in the world"—the Bishop denying, he affirming. This, however, was a small thing. The only point on which the reviewer thought the Bishop rather unsound was, as may be supposed, the doctrine of original sin. Here he used "language not familiar to divines, and apparently inconsistent with the terms of our 9th Article;" yet the reviewer thought the Bishop's dissertation on the subject "perhaps the cleverest essay" in the book—in some parts "masterly in a great degree," and "throughout bearing the strongest marks of long and deep thought, as well as an intimate acquaintance with the works of the fathers, and the learning of the English Church."

Of all the more strictly speculative and metaphysical parts of the work, the reviewer expresses a high opinion.

"The chapters on Natural Theology, on the Duties of Natural Religion, and the different theories of Moral Obligation, contain much learned disquisition on the most interesting topics that can employ the attention of a young divine. The strictures, particularly on the theories of Dr Clarke and Mr Wollaston, are not less profound than accurate, and manifest, on the part of the author, extensive reading joined to an uncommon degree of metaphysical acumen."

Of the Bishop's exposition of the leading doctrines of the Christian faith, the reviewer expresses high approval, singling out the chapter on the Holy Eucharist as being "particularly valuable."

Judging from this review, the reception of the book in England was as favourable as could be expected at the time; but the time was not auspicious. It was a time of transition—the eve of a mighty political change, the fertile origin of many other changes, including a High Church

Revival,* which, in its rapid development, quickly left far behind it the moderate High Churchism of Bishop Gleig. Old manuals of theology soon became obsolete. Such topics as Natural Religion, Original Sin, the Eternal Generation of the Son, Predestination, and even Justification, over which Bishop Gleig's generation had fought and wrangled, and of which his book was full, ceased to exercise a commanding interest. The chief topics with the new party and the rising generation were the Church, the ministry, the sacraments, and ritual, or the outward and objective side of religion generally. The new generation made much of all of which the late generation had made little, and *vice versâ*.

Next year (1828) the Primus, despairing of ever obtaining the consent of the whole of his colleagues to the convocation of a General Synod, resolved at last to act on the consent of the majority of them. He therefore summoned a General Synod to meet at Laurencekirk on the 18th of June 1828. The event showed that this was the proper course; and it would have been well if the Primus had taken it several years earlier, before deafness and other infirmities of age had impaired his business energy. Bishop Low and Bishop Jolly did not attend the Synod; but when they found that their absence not only did not prevent legislation, but, on the contrary,

* See the origin of the Oxford movement, as recorded by the Hon. and Rev. Arthur Perceval and others. The Reform of Parliament, however, may be said to have been the occasion rather than the cause of the movement. The Evangelical movement had reached a stage at which, by the law of such movements, re-action became inevitable. The early promoters were dying out; the original enthusiastic impulse which bore down all opposition and criticism was spent; the defects of the movement became apparent, and the usual result followed—viz., not the regulation of the movement, not the correction of its defects, but the rise of a counter-movement—a movement which tended to exalt and exaggerate everything which the antecedent movement had overlooked and neglected—the running from one extreme to the other.

gave freer play to it, they became eager for another Synod. Bishop Low's reason for objecting to a Synod at this time was apparently much the same as on previous occasions, viz., some temporary dissatisfaction with the action of his colleagues. "It is hinted," wrote Bishop Skinner (May 17, 1828), "that Bishop Low positively refuses to be present, because, forsooth, it has been stated that Dr Walker cannot be admitted to a seat in Synod until a Canon be formed and passed for admitting our theological professor."

Bishop Jolly's reasons were ever the same, and more respectable than cogent.

The Synod met on the day appointed, and did some useful work. By far the most important of its enactments were those of Canon XVI., concerning Synods. It provided that Diocesan Synods should be held every year, and a General Synod every fifth year. Unfortunately, it added a provision, taken from the American Church Constitution, and substantially the same as the Presbyterian Church *Barrier Act*, that "no law or canon be enacted or abrogated, till the same shall have been submitted to the several Diocesan Synods, and approved of by a majority of the clergy, as well as by a majority of those who constitute the General Synod in which said enactment or abrogation was proposed," &c.

Probably the whole of these enactments were of too modern and constitutional a cast for such men as Bishop Jolly. The "barrier" clause, in reality, could hardly have been other than a conservative provision, sometimes perhaps only a drag upon legislation; yet it was regarded as quite revolutionary. It "would lay our Episcopacy in the dust."

It was in this style that Bishop Jolly wrote of it to

most of his colleagues. He was shy of writing about it to the Primus, though he kept saying he was going to do so. He had undoubtedly great respect for the Primus, but the respect was not unmingled with fear; and he always addressed him as "Right Reverend and dear *Sir*," while his mode of addressing any of his other colleagues was "Right Rev. and dear *Brother*." At last he did write the Primus, and was agreeably surprised with the answer which he received. The Primus, it appeared, had never been a consenting party to the "barrier" clause, which was passed in his absence from the Synod chamber.

He wrote that "the first thing that was agitated in the Bishops' Chamber was whether the canons to be proposed and agreed on should be enacted as laws of the Church immediately obligatory, or kept in abeyance till they should be submitted to the Diocesan Synods, and, if approved of by the majority of the clergy, be enacted into laws by the Synod, which was now to be prorogued, and recalled for that purpose next year. This American plan of prorogation and abeyance was strenuously urged, when I answered that, if such was to be the purpose for which the Synod had been called, it should never have been convoked by me, and that, if they were determined on that measure, I should instantly leave them, when no Synod could be held. Bishop Sandford was understood to agree with me, so that the majority in the Bishops' chamber was against the constitution of the XVI. Canon.' "The Primus then declares," says Bishop Jolly, "in most solemn terms that 'he never saw that Canon in its present form till he got it from Edinburgh.' In very humble manner, which, from his station among us, to me is very affecting, he takes blame to himself, fatigued and exhausted as he was by close attention to the Meiklefolla

business* for an hour in the morning, for suffering himself to be called out of the chapel, and so missing the hearing of that Canon when read."

The Primus now spoke of Canon XVI. as "Anti-Episcopal;" no doubt on account of this obnoxious clause. It was not, therefore, difficult for Bishops Jolly and Low and their friends (Dr Walker, &c.) to prevail upon him to summon another General Synod to revise the work of the last. What Bishop Sandford thought of this step does not appear; but Bishops Skinner and Torry were highly indignant at it. Doubtless it was very aggravating to them to be called upon so soon to overhaul their work, especially as the demand for a second Synod proceeded chiefly from those colleagues who had refused to attend and take their share in the work and responsibility of the first. Bishop Skinner, acknowledging (April 8, 1829) an "admirable letter" on the subject from Bishop Torry, speaks of the proposed second Synod as an "absurd and uncalled-for scheme;" and, alluding to the Duke of Wellington's recent sudden concession of the Roman Catholic claims, which he calls an "odious measure," he continues, "With *Premiers* both in Church and State the favourite maxim would now seem to be *voluntas stat pro ratione*." "Nor," he adds, "is the sudden change of sentiment in our brothers of Moray and Ross and Argyle, who were hitherto such stern and strenuous opposers of Synods, less marvellous than the wondrous conversions of our Anti-Catholic statesmen. Some baleful influence surely affects the atmosphere of 1829."

* The "Meiklefolla business" was a dispute between the great body of the Folla congregation, and a small minority headed by the chief proprietor, Mr Leslie of Rothie, about the appointment of a clergyman. The people were most anxious to retain the services of the Rev. James Robertson (now Archdeacon of Nova Scotia), who had been assistant to their late clergyman; but Mr Leslie and his friends succeeded in preventing Mr Robertson's appointment. The case caused great excitement at the time.

Some of the parties who called for a second Synod spoke as if their object in regard to Canon XVI. was merely the correction of an "ambiguous expression;" but it soon transpired that they aimed at a repeal of both the chief provisions of the Canon.

Dr Russell, of Leith, writing to Bishop Skinner (March 21st, 1829), said, "I am glad to hear that you are to attend the Synod in June, for, if I mistake not, there will be an attempt made (not by your friend at Stirling) to undo more of our labour at Laurencekirk than the ambiguous expression of the 16th Canon. The appointment of Quinquennial General Synods gave much satisfaction in this diocese, and I should be sorry were the enactment to that effect repealed."

"Russell," observes Bishop Skinner, "would not have said so much, were he not well assured that such attempts will be made. God grant, my dear sir, that we may have sufficient firmness and strength to withstand such insidious and mischievous machinations. Let us strenuously and decidedly oppose any alteration whatever on the Canon as now printed, beyond what you most judiciously suggest, a proper explanation of any seeming ambiguity in the 16th."

Dr Russell's apprehensions were only too well founded. "An attempt" *was* "being made to undo the work" of the Laurencekirk Synod; not, indeed, as he truly says, by the Primus, but by men who had great influence with the Primus, and who could now easily bend him to their purpose. The attempt proved entirely successful. The General Synod of 1829 met at Edinburgh, June 24th. It was attended by every person who had a seat in it, including Dr Walker, Professor of Theology; and it very effectually "undid" the work of the Laurencekirk Synod,

repealing both the provision which enacted the holding of a General Synod every fifth year, and also that which gave the clergy at large a veto on the acts of the General Synod, through the diocesan Synods. The Primus, and the majority of the Bishops, appear to have yielded entirely to the influence of Bishop Jolly.*

The Synod of Brechin was held this year at Arbroath, August 27. It was attended by the Bishop, who, according to the minute, "delivered an excellent charge, which he was unanimously requested by the brethren to publish, a request which he complied with." The subject was the constitution of the Church, as settled by the recent General Synod; and, in his exposition of it, Bishop Gleig spoke as Bishop Jolly spoke of the relations between Bishops and Presbyters, and of the danger of encroachment by the latter on the prerogatives of the former. After stating (p. 15) that "the 30th of the Canons called Apostolical enjoins a Synod of Bishops to be held twice every year, &c.," he proceeds, "In the present state of our Church, there appears to be no occasion for such frequent Synods, which, in this age of the liberal and rapid *march of intellect*, might be as likely to produce, as to put an end to, ecclesiastical controversies. It is even not impossible that the Presbyters, having obtained—what they had not before the year 1811—the right of sitting in a chamber of their own as constituent members of every General Synod, might be incited by some aspiring but disappointed spirits among them in the next generation (far be it from me to

* In the beginning of April 1829, the Primus wrote to Bishop Skinner, in answer to an enquiry what changes were proposed in the Canons. "Besides correcting the 16th Canon of our present Code, it is the intention of Bishop Jolly and myself to prepare a Canon explaining the constitution of what is called (not very properly perhaps) Diocesan Synods, and defining the respective authorities of the Bishop and Presbyters in such Synods."

say that there are any such in the present), to claim to themselves what their predecessors of the Establishment claimed, a perfect equality of *order* and *authority* with their Diocesans, and a right to sit and vote with them in the same Chamber.* Our Church therefore acted wisely, when, in the late Synod held in Edinburgh, she left the convoking of Synods entirely to the judgment of the majority of the Bishops, &c." Thus far as to the Quinquennial General Synod. The following is substantially the shape in which the "barrier" clause came out of the Synod of 1829: "And though the Presbyters have no authoritative voice whatever, but by their representatives assembled in Synod, it is surely expedient that every Bishop call together a consistory of the clergy in his diocese, some weeks before the assembling of the Synod, that he may hear their opinions on the subjects to be discussed, together with the reasons on which such opinions are founded—not to be *guided* by them *against his own judgment*, even should they be unanimous—but to aid him in deciding the question himself."

The composition of the Charge, as well as the management of the two Synods, betrayed on the part of the Primus a "decline of vigour," only too natural at his advanced age. The long desired opportunity for legislation had come too late, and the result of it was to leave matters very much as it found them. This is how Bishop Jolly wrote of the Charge in a letter to Dr Walker, Jan. 2, 1830. "After long delay, I received the desired Charge,

* Yet the Primus had come to doubt the expediency of having *two* Chambers—as most churchmen probably do now, at least for purposes of deliberation and discussion. "I am not now so convinced as I then (1811) was that this was wisely done. In a Church, not under the control of the State, a Synod divided into two Chambers, mutually balancing each other, is apt to be disturbed by the rivalry of these Chambers, &c." Note to p. 13. Charge of 1829.

which, by God's blessing, shall have I hope salutary effects. But hitherto I have heard little of it. Our friend Mr Cheyne, who has been very keen against the Laurencekirk doings in a letter to Mr Pressley, expressed himself as disappointed with regard to it; not in its matter, but rather in its manner, which he thinks argues great decline of vigour and nervous diction in which the Primus excelled. But perhaps the plain didactic style is best suited to such an address."

The reader will probably consider the reasons against holding frequent (or periodical) General Synods, given in the extract just quoted, as a proof of "decline of vigour." To refuse a reasonable thing because it may, at some future time, possibly lead to a demand for an unreasonable thing, is a too common mode of reasoning, but it is not one to which, in his better days, Bishop Gleig would have had recourse. The infirmities of age grew fast upon him now; and the Synod of 1829 was the last occasion of any importance on which he appeared in public. Bishop Jolly, the Senior Prelate by consecration, was also very infirm; and both of them continued long in a semi-superannuated state. There was no one to take the initiative in anything, and prevent general Church business from coming to a dead-lock. Never was there greater need of some self-acting machinery like the periodical General Synod provision, which these two good men had just repealed.*

* To the writer, the Quinquennial General Synod enactment appears the most important Act that has been passed by the General Synod since the admission of the Representatives of the Presbyters in 1811. But so little importance seems to have been attached to it, then and since, that not one of the historians of the Church takes any notice of its repeal. The abortive attempt at "reform" in 1828 deserves the particular attention of Churchmen at this time. Looked at in the light of contemporary and subsequent history, it is seen to have been part of a general and widespread movement, which at the time it was very easy to misunderstand, and also to misrepresent as utterly subversive of all that was old and

sacred, but which yet was nowhere suppressed by authority, without disastrous consequences—revolution, disruption, or stagnation. In England it terminated with some difficulty in reform; in France, in revolution; in the Established Church of Scotland, in disruption—the effects of which the State would, after thirty years, fain undo by granting now what it refused then. The result of repression in the Episcopal Church was an aggravation of the general apathy or stagnation, which arose from the smallness of the body, the want of sympathy between North and South, and the sluggish circulation, the feeble corporate life of the Church.

CHAPTER XII.—1830-40.

Endeavours to obtain relief from active duties—Anecdote of Laurencekirk Synod—Consecrates Dr Walker to the Bishopric of Edinburgh—Desires a Coadjutor, and proposes to nominate Dr Russell for the office—Brechin Clergy refuse to elect a Nominee—Bishops generally discountenance the project of a Coadjutor—Bishop Torry on the abuses of the Coadjutor system—Commits oversight in transmitting an address to Primate of Ireland—Resigns office of Primus—Consents to the free election of a Coadjutor—Begins to show symptoms of mental decay—His Son's account of his declining years and death—Tablet to his memory—Inscription—Sketches of his character by Dr Neale and the Ex-Chaplain-General—Conclusion.

Soon after the two General Synods the Primus began to take steps to secure relief from the active duties of his offices, from which his growing infirmities, and especially his deafness, incapacitated him. Deafness had interfered considerably with his management of the Synods, and a story is told illustrative of the fact, and also of the Primus's unconscious thinking aloud, or trenchant outspokenness. At the Laurencekirk Synod, the Bishops were divided on some question, and Bishop Torry "roared into his ear" the view of one side. When he ceased, the Primus exclaimed, "stark nonsense!" On which Bishop Sandford "seized the ear-trumpet, and in his choicest language, insinuated the reasons for *his* view." The old man again unconsciously uttered his thought—"starker nonsense still!"

The Primus still performed a few more public acts. One of these must have been to him very interesting and gratifying, viz., the consecration of his friend Dr Walker

to the Bishopric of Edinburgh—an event which took place at Stirling on the second Sunday in Lent, March 7th, 1830.

In August 1831 he* visited his diocese; but as he himself anticipated, for the last time. In writing to Bishop Torry, July 1st, 1831, he says, "I am to hold my visitation in the month of August, and so awful are the times, and so rapidly are the infirmities of age coming upon me, I think it probable it may be my last; and with this notion strongly impressed on my mind, I find it more difficult to compose a proper charge for the clergy, than I ever felt such a composition before."

In the course of his visitation he sounded the clergy on a matter of great delicacy. He had resigned the charge of Stirling Chapel, and he wished to have a coadjutor in the Episcopate. The following letter to Bishop Torry (Nov. 2nd, 1831) will show how he set about this matter:—

"Something more than two years ago, I was seized with fits of giddiness and deafness, such as Johnson informs us 'attacked Dean Swift from time to time, began very early, pursued him through life, and at last sent him to the grave deprived of reason.' My giddiness did not begin *early*, and till lately the fits were neither frequent, nor, with the exception of the first, very violent; but for some months past they have recurred so often, and sometimes with such extreme violence, as to make me apprehensive either of sudden death or of being gradually rendered incapable of discharging the duties, either of a Bishop or of a Parochial Clergyman. I have accordingly resigned my chapel, because my deafness renders me unfit to visit the sick and the dying; and I have long been desirous of having a coadjutor whom I can trust to *think*

* He did not hold a general confirmation this year, but visited some congregations, and held a Diocesan Synod at Montrose.

for me and occasionally to *write* for me. The case I have repeatedly stated to my friend Bishop Walker, naming Dr Russell of Leith as the man whom I think fittest for my coadjutor and successor as Bishop of Brechin. My friend at once saw the urgency of the case, and most heartily approved of my choice, as, if agreed to by our colleagues, might prove very useful to him, as well as to me, for his health, though not so precarious as mine, is far from being strong.

"As I know that no Bishop has a right to nominate his successor, and that no power on earth has a right to obtrude on a Bishop of sound mind a coadjutor whose principles and talents are not what he approves, my friend and I agreed that it would be prudent in me to state the case to my Clergy individually, and, if I should find the majority of them to concur with me in my proposal of Dr Russell for my coadjutor and successor, then to state it to them in a body, and in their name, and my own, to apply to my colleagues for a mandate to the Clergy to meet and elect a successor to their present Diocesan, whom I might assume immediately as my Coadjutor Bishop of Brechin. This course I accordingly followed in my late visitation; and finding Messrs Smith, Garden, Dyce, Spark, Moir, Cushnie, and Henderson of Arbroath (I had not then seen Messrs Jolly, Horsley, Head, or Hatherton), unanimous in opinion, that Dr Russell is the fittest man in the Church for the office of my coadjutor, I took it for granted that there would not be a single dissentient voice when I should state the case to the body when met in Consistory." But it was all otherwise. Before they met in Synod (at Montrose on August 26, 1831), the Clergy had had time to think the matter over, and could also speak their minds more freely. To the Primus's "astonishment," therefore,

the leading Clergy "objected to the whole measure. They agreed that no personal objection could be made to Dr Russell, protesting, at the same time (at least Mr Moir did so), that they had the greatest desire to oblige me; but they objected to the whole measure as contrary to the Canons, because the Bishop or his coadjutor should reside within the Diocese, and because I had used undue influence with the Clergy!! I call God to witness that I used no other influence with the Clergy than what was implied in my opinion that Dr Russell is worthy of the office, and that he would be most agreeable to me."* This the good man, cleaving firmly to the last, to the old traditions, could not conceive to be "undue influence," especially as there was not a single Clergyman in the Diocese of Brechin whom he thought fit to be a Bishop. And he continued to press his request

* In the Minute Book of Brechin we find the clergy's account of this matter. It really differs in no essential particular from the Bishop's own account. The question does not appear to have been put to the vote; and, as only a few of the members expressed their objections to the proposal, the Bishop probably realised but very imperfectly the strength of the opposition. "The Ordinary delivered a charge, which was heard with great interest and attention, and thanks were returned to him by the Presbyters for his excellent and seasonable instructions and advice. The ordinary business of the meeting being finished, the Bishop brought before the clergy his proposal to have Dr Russell appointed as his coadjutor and successor, and said "if the meeting approved of his proposal, he would write to his colleagues, and if he found them willing to concur, ask Dr Russell to accept, and proceed as soon as possible to his consecration." "All the clergy heard with deep sorrow this account of their venerable diocesan's health, but some of them . . . . objected strongly to the manner in which the Bishop proposed to proceed in appointing a coadjutor and successor, as uncanonical. They said that, as they were in fact about to appoint a new Bishop of Brechin, they ought to proceed in the manner which the Canons prescribe in the case of a diocese becoming vacant; that is, that a mandate should be issued, and an election take place in the usual way. The nomination by the Bishop deprived the Presbyters of the opportunity "of making the first choice;" and for the Presbyters to pledge themselves on the suggestion of its diocesan, "was inconsistent with the solemn declaration required by the Canons, that 'no influence, lay or clerical, has been used with them in determining their choice,' &c." "This reasoning was not satisfactory to the Bishop, and conceiving that the majority of the Presbyters acquiesced in his proposal, he wrote a letter to his colleagues requesting their concurrence." This minute is signed by *nine* Presbyters, apparently all who were present.

for a coadjutor. He was prepared to make the necessary sacrifices. "My coadjutor shall receive nothing from the Episcopal Fund whilst I live; nor shall he and I both vote in any Synod that may be called of the Bishops." But the times were changed. The coadjutor system, having been abused, had fallen into discredit, and there was no provision in the existing Canons for the election of a coadjutor. These points were forcibly urged by Bishop Torry in his very discouraging reply. "There is a strong impression on my mind," he says, "that at Bishop Low's consecration, when the subject of having coadjutors was by some means brought under our view, it seemed to be the unanimous opinion of all present that that measure ought not *again* to be revived, as being highly inexpedient in the present circumstances of the Church."

Again, "when the scheme of coadjutorship was in full operation in the Church (much to the disturbance of its harmony), each coadjutor was brought forward by Episcopal influence *only*; and the Clergy complained, and with justice, that their right of election was either reduced to a nullity, by their being compelled, in a manner, on the death of their Diocesan, to elect his coadjutor; or if they judged another *fitter*, and were resolved to assert their privilege, that they were reduced to the painful necessity of overlooking a man, who had perhaps for several years performed Episcopal offices among them."*

The scheme, therefore, "could never have been good," and "ought not to be revived." This was the conclusion of Bishop Torry. He was "compelled to withhold his consent from" the Primus's "proposal." Most of his other colleagues withheld theirs also, and the proposal had to be dropt.

* Letter to Primus Gleig, December 13th, 1831. Torry collection.

The Bishops, however, were impressed with the necessity for doing something to strengthen the Episcopate at this time. But they did not meet to discuss the matter. Had the Quinquennial General Synod enactment been allowed to continue in force, the Bishops and the representatives of the Presbyters would have met soon, and a solution would have been found for the difficulty of the day. A General Synod in 1833 would doubtless have done what was done by the General Synod of 1838—viz., provide for a "free, uninfluenced, and unbiassed election" of coadjutors by the clergy of a diocese.

When 1833 arrived, however, instead of regulating the old coadjutor system by Canon, the Bishops were invited to consider an entirely different mode of increasing their numbers.

"Bishop Low suggested the appointment of a seventh and supernumerary Bishop;" and as the Triennial General Meeting of the Friendly Society was held in Aberdeen in July, it was proposed that the Bishops, when they met in Aberdeen, should hold a Synod to discuss the project. Only two Bishops, however, met in Aberdeen. The Primus "made an attempt to reach the place, but failed by the way, and was obliged to return home." It was then proposed to hold the Synod in Edinburgh in the month of September, on the occasion of the stated meeting of the Pantonian and Bell Trustees. Nothing was done then, however, nor till 1846, when Bishop Low provided an endowment for a seventh Bishopric—that of Argyll and the Isles.

Thus, through the repeal of the provision for a periodical General Synod, Church affairs came to a sort of dead-lock. There was no self-acting machinery. The two senior Bishops, with whom lay the initiative, were practically

ab agendo. They could not be expected to act; and as the most necessary measures touched narrowly the prerogatives of the seniors, the juniors had a delicacy in pressing for action.

The only way in which the Primus could now administer the affairs, either of his diocese or of the Church at large, was through correspondence, and even that was becoming "very irksome to him." This fact is brought out very distinctly in a series of eleven letters of his written at this time (May 27th, 1833, to Nov. 18th, 1834.) Most of these letters are addressed to a member of the Drumlithie congregation (Mr Alexander Beattie, Goukmuir), and all of them treat of the affairs of that congregation, with its repeated vacancies and changes of clergymen, during the short period in question. The letters betray an occasional token of old age—impatience, querulousness, or slight incoherence; but, on the whole, for an octogenarian, they are sufficiently clear and business-like productions. Their chief general interest lies in the striking way in which they illustrate the great and ever recurring difficulty, which, when as yet there was neither Church Society nor Church Council, a poor congregation experienced in finding, and still more in retaining, a tolerably faithful and efficient clergyman. Drumlithie had been for some years in the charge of a Mr Dyer, who, however, became after a time discontented, and eventually, through losing his voice, unfit for duty, "and going off to America, left his congregation under the personal care of a curate, whom, he confessed to me (the Primus), he thought unworthy of the office." For the support of a successor to Mr Dyer, "thirty pounds certain was all that, in a letter written to the Primus, the congregation was made to promise." "No man of

fortune," says the Primus, "could get his principal footman for such wages." "Had we the zeal of the Presbyterian Seceders, double that sum would be offered." If the people would offer £50, or even £40, he would get them £10 more from Church Funds, and a fit man might be secured. Not only was the salary small; there was no parsonage, nor any suitable house to be rented within miles of the church.

That happened, therefore, which might have been expected, when the Primus, in default of a suitable native candidate, ordained for the charge a Mr Oldfield from England, recommended by his son. "We were all much pleased with him," the Primus wrote to Mr Beattie, "and I shall read to the congregation the testimonials of his character, subscribed by three Priests of the Diocese of Canterbury, all well known to me, and countersigned by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who always writes to me, as a friend and brother." (Letter, July 7, 1833). These documents the Primus, of course, meant to read at a regular institution of Mr Oldfield, and for this purpose, chiefly, he appointed a day on which he would visit Drumlithie on his way from Aberdeen, whither he was about to proceed to attend a meeting of the S. E. Friendly Society, accompanied by his son. But he was now too old and frail to be relied upon for keeping any appointments away from his own house and church! As has been stated, he never reached Aberdeen. Neither did he reach Drumlithie. "I was taken so ill at Newhaven on my way," he wrote to Mr Beattie (Sept. 4, 1833), "that if my son had not been with me, I doubt if I should have been able to return to my own house." Thus, in his settlement at Drumlithie, the new pastor was left very much to himself; and so, after three months, the

Primus was "surprised to learn that Mr Oldfield had, without previously informing me, fixed his residence in Laurencekirk, because he could not find in Drumlithie a house that would accommodate himself, his mother, and his pupils." Laurencekirk is seven miles from Drumlithie, far too distant for "the domestic residence" of the minister of Drumlithie. All hints and suggestions for a change of residence appear, however, to have been vain. Mr Oldfield probably found the arrangement as inconvenient and unsatisfactory as either the Bishop or the congregation, but he could not see his way to a better. Anyhow, the reader of the letter is by no means "surprised" when, after a six months' gap in the correspondence, he comes upon the intimation (April 10, 1834), that the Primus has "received Mr Oldfield's formal resignation of the chapel in Drumlithie," and is highly "indignant" "at his abrupt leaving."

The correspondence, however, closes happily, by the Primus introducing, and then congratulating Mr Beattie on "the satisfaction of the congregation," in a young clergyman of native birth, who held the charge with credit and efficiency throughout and beyond the remaining period of the Primus's Episcopate.*

The Primus continued to have the whole charge of the diocese of Brechin three years longer, doing what he could with his pen. For the six years before 1835, no confirmations had been performed in the diocese; but in that year the Bishop asked and obtained help. He wrote to Bishop Torry (May 13th, 1835)—"I completed my eighty-first year yesterday, and have not been able these five years to go into bed or come out of it, and far less to go up and down stairs, without help. The consequence

* The Rev. Wm Webster, now of New Pitsligo.

is that I have not visited my diocese* these six years, nor has the sacred ordinance of confirmation during that long period been regularly administered in it. I have learned that you intend to visit your diocese this season, and may I beg of you to confirm likewise in mine?" . . "I have repeatedly asked for a coadjutor, which I believe was never before refused in this Church to any aged and infirm Bishop." He was still most anxious to have Dr Russell appointed as coadjutor of Brechin. "I am almost confident that Bishop Low would concur with Bishop Walker and me in consecrating Dr Russell—indisputably the most learned man in our Church." . . "If an addition be not soon made to the number of our Bishops, the regular succession of our Scottish Episcopacy will be lost. No doubt but I, as Primus, with the addition of any two other Bishops, could regularly and canonically consecrate Dr Russell, or any other priest; but as I have not the ambition of acting the Archbishop, &c."

In this letter he mentions that his "complaints are extreme deafness and almost perpetual vertigo, which, as it destroyed the mind of Dean Swift, has so greatly weakened mine that I have been twice obliged to stop since I began this letter."

Bishop Torry made some inquiries as to his mode of administering confirmation, so, after specifying the places at which the candidates from the various charges would assemble, the Primus says, "I never make use of the sign of the cross in administering the rite of confirmation. Bishop Rait never did; and he performed all his Episcopal duties in a more dignified and impressive manner than any other of my predecessors whom I have witnessed, &c."—Letter, May 26th, 1835.

* This must mean visitation of all the charges separately, with confirmation in each.—See Ante p. 363.

It was now high time that the Primus should be relieved from the duties both of his Diocese and of the Primacy. It was painful to him to neglect the duties of either office, and any attempt to discharge them could only issue in failure. Something was sure to be overlooked. A very natural but awkward oversight, happily for all parties, brought matters to a crisis. The Primus transmitted an address to the Primate of Ireland, "in the name of the Bishops and Clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church," and "given in their name at Stirling, December 29th, 1835." "Now," wrote Bishop Low (Feb. 26, 1836), "*I* never saw that address, nor so much as ever heard that such an one was even meditated, till I read it in the *John Bull* newspaper, nor do I believe that any Bishop or Clergyman in the Church ever saw it but as I did, except Bishop Skinner, who originated, and Bishop Gleig, who got it manufactured and sent down from London by his son." It is probable that the Primus, if he thought about the matter at all, fancied on receiving the address ready for signature, that it had been already submitted to his colleagues and approved by them. Be this as it may, the oversight proved that the time for resignation had come, and after some correspondence amongst the Bishops, Bishop Torry very delicately gave the hint —writing to the Primus as one who had "always entertained the most friendly and fraternal regards towards" him, and advising "that, after the example of Bishop Kilgour and some others, you may voluntarily lay down the office of Primus, now that age with its usual infirmities renders you unfit for discharging the duties of it any longer . . . it is surely no fault of yours, but the result of God's blessed will, that you have outlived the period of efficient usefulness in reference to that high

office." The hint was well taken, the Primus thanking Bishop Torry "from the bottom of his heart for his very friendly letter," and promising compliance as soon as he could make certain arrangements. He, at this time, needlessly mixed up resignation of the Primacy with resignation of his Diocese. But, as Dr Neale says, "he seems to have acted most uprightly," and, on Feb. 15th, 1837, he sent in his resignation in these words—"I do hereby solemnly declare myself utterly incapable, as well by age as by distress of both body and mind, of longer discharging with propriety the various duties of Primus of the Scotch Episcopal Church, and, in terms of the second Canon of our Church, I resign that office into the hands of the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly, D.D., Bishop of Moray." In the same document he recorded his vote for Bishop Walker as his successor in the Primacy.

It "touched" good Bishop Jolly's "heart" "to receive" this deed from "the venerable man." He "was tremblingly struck" with the proposal to ask the Primus to resign, when it was first communicated to him, and he most earnestly recommended that the matter should be gone about with the utmost delicacy and tenderness. This good man's bearing towards the Primus was, first and last, most respectful and considerate.

The ex-Primus now urged with redoubled earnestness his appeal for a coadjutor. "For God's sake," he wrote, "renounce your absolute objections to coadjutors, and allow me to nominate immediately a coadjutor Bishop of Brechin. I need not tell you that I should nominate Dr Russell, whose late publication rates him in England among the most learned divines of the age." But the day for nominations was past. "I have ever thought," wrote Bishop Walker, now Primus, "that Bishop Gleig was

fully entitled to have a coadjutor, when he several years ago desired it; but then he was not entitled to nominate the person, nor to deprive the clergy of their free right of election. Those clergy, and I believe they were the majority, who were disposed to vote for the man of his choice if they had been left free, refused to do so at his dictation."

Here, again, Bishop Gleig showed himself readier to bow to authority than might have been expected. On the recommendation of the Episcopal Synod, he subscribed a deed empowering the clergy of Brechin "freely to elect a coadjutor and successor" to him. With this act, the long and active public life of Bishop Gleig may be said to have been brought to a close, for the record of his few remaining years is almost a blank.* When already stone-deaf, and almost blind, he began (about 1837) to betray symptoms of softening of the brain. From that time his mental faculties decayed as fast as his bodily; and he soon became dead to the outward world, though, judging from the seeming fervour of his devotional acts, he still "lived mightily unto God." This is how his son writes the last melancholy chapter. "My father had suffered for many years from enlargement of the prostate gland. As he advanced into extreme old age, the malady appeared to subside; but he became subject to fits of sudden insensibility. He would drop down, and be unconscious for a few seconds, and then recover. Once or twice he had nearly sustained a serious injury from these falls. They

* "At the Synod held at Montrose, July 5th, 1837, a message was received through one of the brethren from Miss Fulton, the Bishop's stepdaughter, to the effect that, from his blindness, the Bishop could not now read or write, and 'his deafness had so increased that it was impossible for a third person to make him comprehend the drift of any communication addressed to him.'" "This melancholy communication," "decided the clergy to apply to the Episcopal College" for a mandate to elect a coadjutor.—Minute Book of Brechin.

were the premonitory symptoms of a very gradual softening of the brain, before which his great intellectual faculties gave way. This decay of his faculties began, I think, when he was in his eighty-third year; but it was very slow. He was able then, and for some time afterwards, to take his daily walk, always leaning on my arm, as often as I was able to visit him; and in my absence, tenderly and carefully nursed by his stepdaughter, Miss Mary Fulton. She was indeed more to him than any of his children; for being unmarried, she never left either him or her mother. The reverence which the people paid to the old man was very touching. A large stone was placed on the footpath of the road which leads from the old Stirling bridge to the village of Causeway Head. It was about half-a-mile, or perhaps a little more, from his house. He used to rest upon it before returning. It was called the Bishop's stone; and if it be still in existence, it retains, I have no doubt, the same name. By and bye, strength failed him even for this, and for a year or so, his only movement was from his bedroom to his study—the one adjoining the other. Darkness set in upon him rapidly after this, and it is sad to look back upon, that though he knew me at first on my arrival, he soon began to talk to me about myself, as if I had been a stranger, and often with the humour which seemed never to leave him to the last. Even then, however, the spirit of devotion never left him. Often on going into his room I found him on his knees, and as he was very deaf, I was obliged to touch him on the shoulder before he could be made aware that any one was near him. On such occasions, the look which he turned upon me was invariably that of one lifted above the things of earth. I shall never forget the expression, it was so holy, and yet so bright and cheerful. I was not

with him when he died. The last attack of illness did its work very speedily; but Miss Fulton told me that he slept his life away as quietly as an infant sleeps."

The Bishop's death took place on the 9th* of March, 1840, when he had nearly completed his eighty-seventh year. His remains were placed beside those of Mrs Gleig, "in a chapel attached to the Greyfriars' Church, Stirling, which belongs to the Graham Moirs of Leckie." A tablet was erected to his memory in the church at Stirling, in which he had so long and so faithfully "spoken the Word of Life," with the following inscription:—

In Memoriam.

Viri admodum Reverendi GEORGII GLEIG, LL.D.,
Episcopi Brechinensis.
Necnon in Ecclesiâ Scoticanâ amplissimum dignitatis gradum adepti.
In hoc Sacello
Per annos XLIV. muneribus Sacerdotalibus perfunctus est
Pietate insignis, doctrinâque purâ
Verbi divini gravissimus erat interpres
Fidei incorruptæ Strenuus propugnator
Literis humanioribus, et artium optimarum disciplinis sedulo instructus.
Et in reconditis philosophiæ Studiis subtilis felixque
Sedens ad gubernaculum.
Semper erat sibi constans, in Fratres mitis,† et cum de
Summa re consuleretur propositi fortiter tenax
Obiit VII. Id. Mart. anno Domini MDCCCXL.
Et ætatis Suæ LXXXVII.
Ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖται.
Pastori suo dilecto amici superstites hoc marmor
poni Curaverunt.

* Some writers give March 7th as the date; but the best authorities, including the above inscription, make it March 9th.

† This expression has to be taken with a qualification, the statement of which would be rather incompatible with the brevity of a memorial tablet.

The reader, who has followed the narrative thus far, has doubtless a pretty distinct impression in his mind as to the character of Bishop Gleig. And, if so, he will be glad to compare it with the character given of the Bishop by good judges, who had still better opportunities for judging. The late Dr Neale, who had access to many of the unpublished letters of Bishop Gleig, and his brother Bishops of the period, and who was apparently entirely free from any bias in favour of Bishop Gleig, thus states his view of his character:—"Notwithstanding a certain hastiness of temper, and a disposition to act without reference to his brethren, he (Bishop Gleig) was a great as well as a good man; the greatest Prelate, undoubtedly, whom the Scottish Church had produced since the time of Rattray, if not of Campbell. The power he wielded among his brethren, as shown in their private communications, was most remarkable, and the more so as he had been twice, as we have seen, rejected by the College, and was elected Primus from his merits, rather than from his popularity. As a metaphysical writer, even in metaphysical Scotland, he bore no small reputation; and as a critic, he was among the first of the day. We have seen that some of his theological opinions, especially on Original Sin, were suspected by some of his brethren; on the last-named point they approached curiously to the Tridentine dogmas."*

In substantial agreement with this brief sketch is a yet briefer one by the Bishop's own distinguished son. "I know that his brethren feared more than they loved him; but he was a true man, and if hasty at times and somewhat impatient of mediocrities, he was generous and even

* Life and Times of Bishop Torry, pp. 188-9.

tender in his feelings, and anxious at all times to bring forward merit."*

The reader will probably admit that these two brief but graphic sketches agree with each other, and also with the impression derived from this memoir. Each of the two presents the same well-marked character from a slightly different point of view. The lights and the shades are the same; the strength and the weakness, more or less clearly indicated by each, are the same—the strength, namely, of a strong mind and a warm heart, and the corresponding weaknesses of over-reliance on self, and impatience of opposition and contradiction.

There is, in fact, no possibility of mistake as to the character of Bishop Gleig; for the merits and the defects lie on the surface. They are the merits and the defects of an open, honest, energetic nature, that always gives full and free expression to its feelings, and goes straight to its object. The defects are chiefly those of manner and temper. They could never obscure the merits or the powers of the good man, though they often neutralised their influence. They could not hinder his promotion to the Episcopate, though they retarded it. They could not prevent his elevation at the first opportunity to the high office of Primus, though they rendered his Primacy less fruitful in Church progress and extension than it otherwise might have been.

In judging of his administration as Primus, however, it ought ever to be borne in mind that his best days were over before he was raised to the Primacy. He was then twenty years older than Bishop John Skinner was at *his* accession to that highest office; and he had lost the vigour and elasticity of mind necessary to

* Letter to writer of 22nd October 1874.

assimilate new ideas and keep abreast of the times, to overçome the ultra conservatism of his chief colleagues, and introduce such administrative and governmental reforms as would enable the Church to take advantage of her altered position in the nation, and fully develop her resources. In truth, he did more for Church reform and progress during the seven years of his ordinary Episcopate than he did during the twenty years of his Primus-ship.

The chief cause of his comparative failure in administration can be clearly traced to his persistent adherence to the fast obsolescent practice of interfering in Diocesan elections. Every attempt that he made in that way was not only a failure in itself, but it sowed the seeds of failure in more legitimate attempts, weakening his influence with his colleagues and with the Church generally, and raising obstacles to co-operation. On the other hand, from the views and temper of most of his colleagues, and the then circumstances of the Church, it was highly improbable that he could have done very much more than he did do. In some important particulars, the churchmen of those days realised but faintly the actual condition of their Church, and the necessity to real progress of strict adaptation of their ecclesiastical arrangements to their own peculiar circumstances. They would look for models abroad to churches, whose circumstances differed essentially from their own.* Thus there were great and undoubted obstacles to healthy movement, both within the Church

* It was after the model of the larger English Convocation that the General Synod was (in 1811), divided into two chambers, instead of one as used to be the case in Scotland, and is now in York Province and in Ireland. "Her Prelates naturally concluded that they could not serve her more effectually than by bringing her constitution as near as possible to that of the Mother Church, &c."—Bishop Gleig's charge of 1829, p. 12. He had already come to doubt the wisdom of this arrangement. "I am not now so convinced as I then was that this was wisely done."—Note, p. 13. See chap xi.

and without. Hence many and various things have to be taken into account in judging of Dr Gleig's administration, whether as Bishop or as Primus. And if we seek, with Dr Neale, to fix his place in the order of Episcopal merit, we shall have to discriminate more carefully. By "the greatest Prelate" ought, doubtless, to be understood the greatest administrator; and no Post-Revolution Scotch Prelate has such high claims to that honour as Bishop John Skinner. But if, by "the greatest Prelate," we understand, with Dr Neale, the greatest *man*, who has held the Prelatical office—the greatest thinker and writer—the man of the highest mental power and capacity—of deepest learning, and most extended literary reputation, no name on the roll of the Post-Revolution Episcopate stands so high as that of George Gleig.

FINIS.

INDEX TO BISHOP JOLLY.

INDEX TO BISHOP GLEIG.

APPENDIX.

BISHOP GLEIG.

NEW CHURCH AT STIRLING.

SINCE the completion of the Memoir of Bishop Gleig, a handsome Church has been consecrated for the congregation at Stirling, replacing the one which replaced the building erected by the Bishop soon after the repeal of the Penal Laws.

MEMORIAL TABLET, P. 376.

The inscription on the above tablet was written, it seems, by Bishop Russell, the life-long friend of Bishop Gleig, a fact which accounts for the general accuracy of the graceful tribute, and also for an occasional exaggeration. It is a pity, perhaps, that the inscription was not in English, so as to be intelligible to the congregation at large. Dean Moir of Glasgow, who lived in the neighbourhood at the time that the tablet was put up, recalls a ludicrous blunder made by a member of the Stirling congregation in striving to puzzle out a meaning from some part of the inscription. When he came to the sentence which speaks of the Bishop's consistency,—*semper erat sibi constans*—he took the word *sibi* for a proper name—that, namely, of the pew-opener, an old Highland woman, familiarly called *Sibbie*; and seeing conjoined with *sibi* the very English looking word *constans*, he jumped at once to the conclusion that here was an appropriate commemoration of the pastor's kind appreciation of the humble services of his humble servant; and he muttered approvingly, "Weel, he *was* aye kind to Sibbie!"

THE RULING PASSION STRONG IN DOTAGE.

Dean Moir, as a young man, living near the Bishop, saw him occasionally when his faculties were wrecked, and when "from his eyes the tears of dotage flowed." The last time Mr Moir called, the Bishop cried like a child, and said "Nobody visits me now," "but," he added, articulating imperfectly, "I wish you as well as man can, though I'm not a Hutchinsonian like John Skinner of Forfar."

MR GARDEN OF STONEHAVEN'S BAD READING (P. 288).

On this subject, the writer has received from another clerical friend (the Rev. A. Ranken) an anecdote very characteristic of Bishop Gleig. The Bishop earnestly advised Mr Garden to take lessons in reading. The embarrassed Garden professed his readiness to comply, but said, "From whom shall I take lessons, Sir?" "From *anybody*, Sir," was the silencing rejoinder.

BISHOP JOLLY.

The publication of the life of Bishop Jolly has brought out, from various unexpected quarters, striking additional testimonies to the deep veneration and esteem in which the Bishop was held, especially in his own neighbourhood, where his saintly character was best known.

A ROUGH RIDE FOR THE BISHOP'S BLESSING.

A correspondent of the *London Guardian* (Sept. 18, 1878), relates the following anecdote, which was told to him by the late eminent London Conveyancer, Mr Christie, son of the Rev. Mr Christie, Woodhead, Fyvie, Aberdeenshire. (See Bishop Jolly, pp. 31, 2.) "When a boy of fourteen, he (Mr Christie) was sent by his father eleven miles across a rough country, on a horse, with a blanket for a saddle, and a halter for a bridle, simply to see Bishop Jolly, to kneel down at his feet, and get his blessing, and to return; 'and,' said he, 'it was well worth doing; and now, if he were alive, and I had the opportunity, I would do it again.'"

Probably the halter-bridle and blanket-saddle were Mr Christie's humorous exaggerations of his imperfect outfit; this, at least, seems the decided opinion of Mr Christie's Northern friends; but all else, in this interesting anecdote, may be taken as strictly true and typical.

Another anecdote, equally interesting, has just been communicated to the writer, on excellent authority. A worthy couple, belonging to the same neighbourhood as Mr Christie, after being united, set out on their marriage jaunt; but soon came back again. It turned out that they had gone straight to Fraserburgh, asked and obtained Bishop Jolly's blessing, and then came straight home again.

SAINT JOLLY.

A lady, now living in Leith, remembers having once had her attention attracted by a commotion on the streets of Banff, accompanied with the cry, "Here's Saint Jolly!" and going to the door, she beheld the aged Bishop moving slowly along the street, leaning on the arm of Mr Pressley on the one side, and of Mr Bruce on the other, while the people, flocking from all sides with reverent interest, "thronged him and pressed him." Soon afterwards, the lady made a pilgrimage to Fraserburgh, for the express purpose of hearing the good man officiate; and she tells, with great fervour, of "the holy delight" with which she listened to the first utterances of his "feeble voice," pronouncing the absolution; of the thrilling satisfaction with which she drank in every word of his mouth; and the intense gratification which she felt, when, on leaving the Church, she was honoured with "three bows from the venerable man." The lady never speaks of him but as "Saint Jolly."

THE ANGELS "LAYING THE BISHOP OUT."

Mrs Chapman, of Milton Rectory, Cambridge, daughter of the late Rev. Mr Hagar, Lonmay, Bishop Jolly's nearest clerical neighbour, had "long wished for a Life of the venerated Bishop Jolly, whose holy hands were laid upon her head;" and she not only furnishes convincing proofs that she herself greatly "esteemed and honoured that truly Apostolic man," but also supplies an anecdote which illustrates the strength of the veneration which was felt for him by the people amongst whom he had so long gone out and come in. "I have heard," she says, "that the Fraserburgh people say, 'The Angels laid the Bishop out when he died.'" —(Letter to Writer, Sept. 30, 1878).

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

Rev. Mr Chapman, Rector of Milton, Cambridge, was "much interested in a conversation with the revered Bishop. Having asked him his opinion of Prayers for the Dead, which Mr Chapman thought had given rise to the error of Purgatory, Bishop Jolly admitted it might be so, and only allowed of Prayers for the Dead awaiting in Paradise the Consummation of all things."—(Letter of Mrs Chapman, October, 14, 1878).

THE JOLLY CLUB.

A laudable attempt which was made soon after his death, to do honour to Bishop Jolly, and fix attention on his character and example, failed in a rather singular way. When it was proposed to establish a society like the Spalding Club for the republication of old Episcopal works, one of the first names suggested for it was that of Bishop Jolly. But the first utterance of the words "The Jolly Club" sufficed to quash the suggestion. The name would have been too expressive; and so for the Jolly Club was substituted "The Spottiswoode Society."

DR JOHN HILL BURTON.

The Historian of Scotland alludes to the above fact in his Book-hunter (pp. 220-1-2), and then proceeds to pay his own high tribute to the memory of the good Bishop (*Robert* Jolly, as he mistakenly calls him). "He was," he says, "a man of singular purity, devotedness, and learning. If he had no opportunity of attesting the sincerity of his faith by undergoing stripes and bondage for the church of his adoption, he developed in its fulness that unobtrusive self-devotion not inferior to martyrdom, which dedicates to obscure duties the talent and energy that in the hands of the selfish and ambitious would be the sure apparatus of wealth and station. He had, no doubt, risen to an office of dignity in his own Church; he was a bishop. But to understand the position of a Scottish Bishop in these days, we must figure parson Adams, no richer than Fielding has described him, yet encumbered by a title, ever associated with wealth and dignity, to deepen the incongruity of his lot, and throw him more than ever on the mercy of the scorners. The office was indeed conspicuous,

not by its dignities or emoluments, but by the extensive opportunities it afforded for self-devotion. We have noticed his successor of the present day figuring in newspaper paragraphs as "The Lord Bishop of Moray and Ross." It did not fall to the lot of him of whom we write, to render his title so flagrantly incongruous. A lordship was not necessary, but it was a principle of his Church to require a bishop, and in him she got a bishop. In reality, however, he was the parish clergyman of the small and poor remnant of the Episcopal persuasion, who inhabited the odoriferous fishing-town of Fraserburgh. There he lived a long life of such simplicity and abstinence as the poverty of the poorest of his flock scarcely drove them to. He had one failing to link his life with this nether world—a failing that leaned to virtue's side; he was a Book-Hunter. How with his poor income, much of which went to feed the necessities of those still poorer, he should have accomplished it, is among other unexplained mysteries. But somehow he managed to scrape together a curious and interesting collection, so that his name became associated with rare books, as well as with rare Christian virtues."

BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

The Life of the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly, Bishop of Moray, 2s. 6d.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"The Life of Bishop Jolly, while preserving from oblivion the memory of a learned and saintly prelate of a very primitive and now extinct type, forms, at the same time, a valuable contribution to the history of Scottish Episcopacy. . . . Mr Walker has done good service by writing the life of a man of whom all Scotsmen may be proud."—*Scotsman.*

"The 'venerable primitive and apostolic Bishop' had a singular power of winning the affectionate esteem of those who knew him; and his simple unworldly life, and constant piety and self devotion, will make the reader of this brief and interesting memoir henceforth refuse to Bishop Wilson of Sodor and Man the title of 'the *last* of the saints.'"—*London Academy.*

"We earnestly advise our readers, of whatever denomination, to peruse this volume. They will find there an example of learning, piety, and humility, such as the world has not frequently seen at any time, and such as in our busy and bustling age is still more rare. And the narrative does not lose by its setting."—*Aberdeen Journal.*

"The value of the memoir now before us we think far beyond what would be expected from its size and pretensions. Indeed, works of this class, and this work in particular, have a twofold value. They present us with not only the histories of men, but the histories of Churches."—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

"Those among us who can look back some thirty or forty years remember that the name of Bishop Jolly was one that we were taught to venerate. The present memoir shows him to us as a meek and gentle old man, holding up the light of the Church in some of her most trying times, shining, indeed, rather by what he *was* than by what he *did*. It is written by a loving hand, full of reverence, but with strong appreciation of Scottish humour."—*London Guardian.*

"The specific features of the saintly type, the utter unworldliness, the purity of soul, the 'sweet reasonableness of the Gospel,' the devoted piety of the inner life, the love of souls, conduct in its minutest details ordered and regulated by reference to the law of God—these features all appear in an impressive manner in the character of Alexander Jolly. The work is executed throughout with good sense and good taste, and we can heartily recommend it, not only as presenting us with the fair image of a type of character now seldom met with, but as giving an interesting insight into the somewhat obscure history of the Scottish Episcopal Church from 1756 to 1839."—*Scottish Guardian.*

"We had marked many passages for quotation from this excellent and interesting little memoir. We recommend it very heartily to our readers, as containing the portrait of a man, pure in his life, studious and retired in habits, and a striking example of antique piety, simplicity, and benevolence."—*Dundee Advertiser.*

"This will be a welcome volume to many Scottish Episcopalians. It describes briefly, but fully, and in excellent taste, the life of a man, who would have been canonised had he belonged to the Roman Catholic Church. Mr Walker has performed the work in an excellent spirit, and with much discrimination. The book is one which may be perused with much enjoyment by people of all religious communions."—*Northern Ensign.*

"The book, with its anecdotes and memories of non-juring days, is a pleasant contribution to the history of religion in Scotland in one of its obscurest bye-paths."—*Edinburgh Daily Review.*

"An exquisite picture of the life and character of a good man. . . . The work is well written, and will be read with interest by all sections of the Christian community."—*John O' Groat Journal.*

"A very interesting and readable book . . . it is well got up, and contains many racy anecdotes of a time and generation that have passed away."—*Brechin Advertiser.*

"We gladly welcome the little volume now published, giving a sketch of Bishop Jolly's quiet and unostentatious, secluded, but eminently godly life. Mr Walker has done full justice to it, and into his interesting narrative he draws much information about the Church to which Bishop Jolly belonged, and about various men of mark connected with it."—*Elgin Courant and Courier.*